

HOW NEW YORK CITY
ADMINISTERS ITS SCHOOLS
ERNEST C. MOORE

SCHOOL EFFICIENCY SERIES
PAUL H. HANUS





Class LB 2819

Book .M 6

Copyright N^o

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.







SCHOOL EFFICIENCY SERIES

How New York City
Administers Its Schools
A Constructive Study

“That state in which the law is subject and has no authority, I perceive to be on the highway to ruin . . . The legislators ought not to allow the education of children to become a secondary or accidental matter.” — PLATO.

SCHOOL EFFICIENCY SERIES

Edited by PAUL H. HANUS

How New York City Administers Its Schools A Constructive Study

By ERNEST CARROLL MOORE, LL.B., PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, YALE UNIVERSITY, FORMERLY SUPERIN-
TENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA



YONKERS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
WORLD BOOK COMPANY

1913

Copyright, 1913, by World Book Company. Entered at
Stationers Hall, London, England. All rights reserved.

SES: MHNY — 1

LB 2819
M16

2

#1.50

©Cl. A343273

201

To

THE CHILDREN OF THE GREAT CITY
OF NEW YORK

EDITOR'S PREFACE

THIS book has an unusual origin. During the school year 1911-12, I was placed in charge of the educational aspects of the school inquiry undertaken by the Committee on School Inquiry of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York. With the approval of the Committee, I secured Professor Moore's services to investigate the organization and work of the Board of Education and the Local School Boards.

The Committee, for reasons of its own, "rejected" Professor Moore's report. Soon after, it was, however, published by the Committee in the *City Record* — but without Professor Moore's final revision or mine, and with the omission of the last chapter — in a report made by the Committee on School Inquiry to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

The action of the Committee could not make Professor Moore's report any the less a portion of my report; it merely prevented me from securing its publication as a part of the complete report which I submitted to the Committee.

Professor Moore's report is an exceptionally valuable document. On the basis of a comprehensive, clear, and convincing exposition of existing conditions, it points out the way to progressive improvement in the administration of the public school system of the City of New York; but because similar conditions are common throughout the country, we hope the book will be helpful to all who are interested in school administration, whether as laymen who wish to study their functions as members of boards of education, or as professional workers who are called upon

to lead in the definition of educational policies. On the clearness of vision and executive capacity of such persons boards of education must rely for the satisfactory discharge of educational responsibilities.

Accordingly, I welcomed the opportunity, in coöperation with Professor Moore, to publish his report in its complete form, and as the first of a series of books on school efficiency to be issued by the publishers of this volume. Except for the final proof-reading and the addition of the chapter omitted from the *City Record*, the report is here published as submitted to me by Professor Moore, and by me included in my report to the Committee.

PAUL H. HANUS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
January, 1913.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
EDITOR'S PREFACE. BY PAUL H. HANUS	vii
PLAN OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY	I
CHAPTER	
I. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, HOW CONDITIONED AND ORGANIZED	4
II. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION	10
III. THE SITUATION AT PRESENT IN NEW YORK . .	23
IV. THE EFFECT OF THE METHOD UPON EDUCATION	42
V. THE RELATION OF SCHOOL APPROPRIATION TO ASSESSED VALUATION OF SCHOOL GROWTH SINCE 1899	57
VI. NEED FOR SIMPLIFIED METHODS OF ACCOUNTING TO THE CITY	75
VII. THE KIND OF BOARD OF EDUCATION NEEDED .	85
VIII. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND ITS COMMITTEES	94
IX. REPORTING UPON COST	113
X. THE PRINTED REPORTS AND RECORDS OF THE BOARD	121
XI. HOW ESTIMATES ARE PREPARED	127
XII. THE OFFICES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION . .	148
XIII. THE ACQUIRING OF SITES	155
XIV. THE CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS	165
XV. THE CARE OF BUILDINGS	192
XVI. THE FURNISHING OF SUPPLIES	209
XVII. THE BUREAU OF LECTURES AND OTHER SUPPLE- MENTARY SCHOOL ACTIVITIES	220

CHAPTER	PAGE
XVIII. THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS	224
XIX. A SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	233
APPENDIX A THE TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-ONE QUESTIONS	241
APPENDIX B A CHAPTER ON THE MAKING OF THE SCHOOL BUDGETS	298
APPENDIX C TRANSFERS IN 1912	310
APPENDIX D RESIGNATIONS IN 1912	311
INDEX	313

How New York City Administers Its Schools

HOW NEW YORK CITY ADMINISTERS ITS SCHOOLS

PLAN OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY

“**T**HE common school system is an institution of the State and not of any particular locality therein.” (Hutchinson *v.* Skinner, 21 Misc. 729.) The officers thereof are not local, or town, or county officers, but officers of such state system. The control over the state system of common schools is vested in the State Commissioner of Education. All moneys required for school purposes in New York City are appropriated by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, and the Board of Aldermen of the city.

“The management and control of the public schools” (1061, Rev. Charter) is vested in the Board of Education, which is composed of forty-six members appointed by the Mayor for a term of five years. Each borough is entitled to the following representation upon the board: Manhattan, 22; The Bronx, 4; Brooklyn, 14; Queens, 4; Richmond, 2. Each member is assigned by the president of the board to membership in one of the forty-six local school boards.

Under the Revised Charter the Board of Education has the following powers and duties:

It has the powers of a corporation; represents the school system before the Board of Estimate; it uses, controls, and disposes of school property; enacts by-laws; establishes and conducts elementary, high, evening, vacation schools, etc.; provides training schools for teachers; maintains the nautical school; maintains free lectures; appoints janitors; adopts or modifies courses of study upon recommendation of Board

2 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

of Superintendents; has care and management of the retirement fund, and establishes rules and regulations for its administration; retires teachers; tries charges against principals or teachers; approves or modifies decisions reached by local school boards upon trials of teachers; administers the general school fund, three mills on assessed valuation of city property for teachers' salaries, and additional funds granted by financial authorities of the city, and special school fund for other purposes; acts as board of trustees of the Normal College,¹ etc.

As required by law, there is an Executive Committee composed of fifteen members of the board, together with the President of the board as its *ex-officio* chairman.

The board has, by its by-laws, created the following standing committees, whose members are appointed by the President of the board:

- A Committee on Finance of five members.
- A Committee on Buildings of nine members.
- A Committee on Supplies of seven members.
- A Committee on By-laws and Legislation of five members.
- A Committee on Sites of nine members.
- A Committee on Elementary Schools of nine members.
- A Committee on High Schools and Training Schools of nine members.
- A Committee on Special Schools of seven members.
- A Committee on Vocational Schools and Industrial Training of five members.
- A Committee on Studies and Textbooks of five members.
- A Committee on Care of Buildings of seven members.
- A Committee on Lectures and Libraries of seven members.
- A Committee on the Nautical School of seven members.
- A Committee on Athletics of five members.

For the conduct of its business the Board of Education maintains the following offices, boards, and bureaus: The secretary's office, with the secretary of the board, the as-

¹ This statement is taken from the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools.

sistant secretary, and an office staff of twenty-seven persons; the city superintendent's office, with a staff composed of the City Superintendent, the board of associate superintendents, eight in number, twenty-six district superintendents, four examiners, and an office force of sixty-one persons; in addition, there are twenty-four clerks of local school boards and district superintendents; the Bureau of Audit and Account, in charge of the Auditor of the Board of Education, with a staff of fifty-nine persons; the Bureau of Buildings, under the direction of the Superintendent of School Buildings, with a staff of forty-six persons; the Bureau of Supplies, under the direction of the Superintendent of School Supplies, with a force of one hundred and twenty-eight persons; the Bureau of Lectures, under the direction of the Supervisor of Lectures, with a staff of eight persons; the Bureau of Libraries, under the direction of the Superintendent of Libraries, with a staff of two persons; the office of the supervisor of janitors, with the Supervisor in charge, and five persons to assist him; the Board of Retirement consists of the President of the Board of Education, the Chairman of the Committee on Elementary schools, High schools and Training schools, the City Superintendent of Schools, and three members selected from the principals, assistants to principals, and teachers of the public day schools.

The Normal College of the City of New York is a separate and distinct corporation. The members of the Board of Education, together with the President of the College, are *ex officio* the trustees of said college.

CHAPTER I

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, HOW CON- DITIONED AND ORGANIZED

GENERAL STATEMENT

THIS is next to the largest school department under central control in the world.¹ It must instruct more foreign-born, non-English-speaking children than any other school system in existence, and, being in the leading city, it has a duty to lead the public education of the nation. The natural difficulties which face the Board of Education are almost insuperable, but artificial difficulties have been superadded to its stupendous task, which render it wellnigh impossible. The method by which New York City administers its schools is that of the paralyzed arm. If money must be raised for school purposes each committee of the Board of Education estimates the separate needs of its division, the finance committee reviews them, the board adopts them, the Comptroller's staff suggests changes in them, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment modifies them, and the Board of Aldermen may then reduce them. When the appropriations are finally made, they are segregated into specific items for particular uses, and transfers of funds which the exigencies of the school business necessitate can then be made only by formal application on the part of the Board of Education, and by equally formal resolution authorizing the same, adopted by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

¹ See statistical table and tabular statement showing comparison with other cities (pages 5 and 6).

ATTENDANCE FOR THE YEARS 1907 TO 1911, IN VARIOUS ACTIVITIES

Conditions and Organizations

5


	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911
Day Elementary Schools ¹	513,669	540,388	550,770	559,055	583,676
Day High Schools ¹	20,566	24,555	28,412	31,417	33,794
Training Schools ¹	1,530	1,782	2,058	2,113	2,002
Truant Schools ¹	165	194	359	380	392
Vocational Schools for Boys ¹	61	157	327
Manhattan Trade School for Girls ¹	228	282
Evening Elementary Schools ³	33,205	33,621	28,082	29,341	32,348
Evening High Schools ³	7,994	10,021	9,614	10,367	11,509
Vacation Schools ¹	16,100	14,586	16,643	18,504	20,367
Vacation Playgrounds ¹	50,052	54,416	91,849	100,799	105,897
Evening Roof Playgrounds ³	25,885	22,654	16,572	19,220	19,631
Vacation Baths ²	614,732	648,368	554,593	589,869	657,619
Evening Recreation Centers ³	9,545	11,148	12,084	14,565	20,085

¹ Average daily attendance.

² Aggregate attendance.

³ Average nightly attendance.

6 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*



If a site for a new school house must be acquired, the local school board, or some other agency, notifies the Board of Education, the Board of Education entrusts the matter to its Committee on Sites, the committee appoints a sub-

committee, which goes over the ground and recommends the site to be selected. The committee selects it, and recommends that the Comptroller enter into negotiations about it, and then that the Board of Education approve its selection. The Board of Education requests the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to authorize the acquirement of the site which it has selected. That board investigates, and frequently recommends that the Board of Education select another site which it suggests. The process is gone over again, and at length the title is acquired. If the need for a site has not been foreseen when the "Corporate Stock" estimates were made, the process is much longer, and may even be deferred until the Corporate Stock Budget for the next year is approved.

A maximum sum has been segregated for each of the chief items in a building at a given location. Sketch plans are drawn, they must be submitted to the Municipal Art Commission for preliminary approval. The final plans are drawn. They must be submitted to the Municipal Art Commission for final approval, the Board of Education, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, the borough Building Department, the Department of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity, one after the other in order. Finally, the specifications and form of advertisement are sent for approval to the Corporation Counsel. Then an advertisement for bids must appear for ten days in the *City Record*, and, at the expiration of this period, bids are opened by the Superintendent of School Buildings. If, because of any unforeseen happening, the cost of the building should exceed the sum allowed for specific items in the building by the finance authorities of the city for its construction, a long process of securing supplementary funds must be undertaken.

If premises must be leased for school purposes, the staff of the Superintendent of Buildings makes a report upon them; then the City Superintendent of Schools certifies that they are needed; then the Superintendent of Buildings of

8 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

the borough concerned, the sanitary superintendent of the Department of Health, and, in some cases, the Fire Commissioner, are asked to make an inspection of them. When objections are made to conditions and the owner corrects them, a reinspection is necessary, then terms are arranged with the owner, and, when all the necessary certificates are obtained, the Committee on Buildings recommends to the Board of Education that it proceed to obtain the lease. If it approves it adopts a resolution requesting the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund to authorize the Board of Education to make a lease in accordance with the terms proposed. The matter is then referred to the Comptroller of the City of New York, who, through the bureau of real estate in his office, examines the property and prepares a report to the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, setting forth his opinion as to whether or not the action proposed will be for the best interests of the city. Then the Commissioners authorize or refuse the lease.

Then a janitor must be employed to care for the building. The Board of Education must take his name from a civil service list, and must ask the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to recommend that the Board of Aldermen fix his salary. If his work increases to the extent of entitling him to a change of rate for his services, action must again be taken in the same manner by all three bodies, and, no matter what the emergency, he will not be paid for extra work until after the date when the resolution leaves the Mayor.

Salary schedules for each division in the offices of the Department of Education are fixed, and the number of employees allowed is specified by the fiscal department of the city. If the Board of Education desires to promote a clerk at \$540 per year, or any other wage, in its bureau of supplies to a position at \$600 per year in its bureau of audit and account, it must obtain the approval of the Municipal Civil Service Commission of the promotion, and the authorization of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to make the transfer.

The control of all funds for lighting and power in school houses is turned over to the Department of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity.

On the teaching side all names, both high and low, on an eligible list of candidates for appointment must be exhausted, or three years must have elapsed before the names at the head of a new list can be taken. Temporary certificates are, with few exceptions, made into permanent certificates, and court evidence of incompetence must be produced before a teacher can be dismissed for that reason from the service.

The legal functions of the Board of Education have not been clearly determined, nor have those which undoubtedly belong to it been enforced; and it has no general manager to organize and direct its work.

REORGANIZATION NEEDED

This condition of affairs is an accumulation of ill-considered laws and regulations, and a service-defeating division of power and responsibility such as is bound, if it continues, to destroy the educational welfare of the city. A reorganization of the present system of financing and administering the public schools of New York is imperative. The following report on the conditions, organization, and work of the Board of Education is a summary statement of the situation.

The first matter which conditions the work of the Board of Education is the Education Law of the State of New York. We have, therefore, made an effort to determine what the law is. In this we have had the assistance of the Law Division of the New York State Education Department, and its chief, Mr. Frank B. Gilbert, has examined and approved the legal features of our report. The financial arrangements which condition the work of the board naturally call for attention. A greater time would have made possible a more exhaustive report, but every effort has been put forth to make this one exact.

CHAPTER II

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

“**T**HERE shall be in the City of New York, as constituted by this act, a Board of Education which shall have the management and control of the public schools, and of the public school system of the city, subject to the general statutes of the state relating to the public school instruction and to the provisions of this act” (1061, the Revised Charter). The Board of Education of New York City shall consist of 46 members appointed by the Mayor for a term of five years. “For the purposes of this chapter the Board of Education of the City of New York shall possess the powers and privileges of a corporation” (1062). “There shall be the following administrative departments in said city — Department of Education” (96). “The head of the department of education shall be called the Board of Education, and shall consist of 46 members, as hereafter provided” (108).

What is the legal status of the board which is thus created? Is it a separate corporation, or a department of the city government? Are the public school officers officers of the state or officers of the city? Is the public school system itself a municipal affair or a general affair? The law on these subjects is relatively clear.

THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Article 9 of the Constitution of the State of New York directs that “the legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a system of free common schools wherein the children of this state may be educated.” In

conformity with this direction of the Constitution the legislature, by general laws, has created a system of public schools. The courts and the legislature itself have repeatedly held that this "common school system is an institution of the state, and not of any particular locality therein" (*Hutchinson v. Skinner*, 21 Misc. 729), and that the officers thereof are not local or town or county officers, but officers of such state system. In *Dannat v. Mayor* (6 Hun, 88), the court held that the City of New York was not liable for a contract entered into by the Board of Education, and declared the status of the board to be as follows:

"The Board of Education is not and has never been other than a distinctive educational branch of government or separate organization having by the statute (1851) its own separate funds and empowered to draw money in accordance with the provisions of special statutes. . . .

"This view of the subject is based on the proposition that the board has a distinct, separate and independent organization invested with extraordinary powers and duties exclusively conferred upon it, and the officers connected with the system of which it forms a part, and with which the defendants cannot interfere, and over which they have no supervisory power or control . . . and upon the further proposition that the department is in reality managed and controlled by a board of officers created by statute with specific powers and duties to perform a public service not peculiarly local or corporate, but as part of a general system, and who are independent of the defendants as to their tenure of office and the manner of discharging their duties."

Particularly illuminating is the decision (January, 1896) of Judge Gaynor in the case of *Ridenour v. The Board of Education of the City of Brooklyn* (15 Misc. 418), for it supplies an outline of the development of educational administration in the present City of New York.

. . . "He is an employee of the Board of Education. It is not a part of the corporation of the City of Brooklyn, but is itself a local school corporation, like every board of school trustees throughout the state (General Corporation Law, Section 3), and is, like every such board, an integral part of the general school system of the state. It is a state and not a city agency, doing state and not city work and functions. Education is not a city, village, county, or town business. It is a matter belonging to the state government. From its comprehensive foundation by Chapter 75 of the laws of 1795 down to the recent codification of our school laws (Consolidated School Law, Laws of 1894, Chapter 556), our state system of education has remained a consistent whole. The present Board of Education of the City of Brooklyn is as distinctly a part of that whole as is any school district in the state. It is the lineal successor to the powers and duties formerly performed by the trustees of the several school districts of Kings County. The City of Brooklyn was incorporated in 1834 (Laws of 1834, Chapter 92). Its first charter is silent concerning public education. It conferred no power in respect to it upon any board or officer of the city. It left all the school districts of the locality as they had previously existed and been governed, viz., by the district trustees and the town commissioners. The next year the legislature made it the duty of the Common Council to appoint the trustees of the several school districts, and also the Commissioners, instead of their being elected, as formerly. . . . The legislature did not thereby make them city officers. It often happens that city officers are required by a statute to appoint individuals to do specified state duties, but that does not make such appointees city officers, or make the city liable for their acts. . . . By Chapter 63 of the Laws of 1843 the Common Council was required to appoint two or more persons from each school district to constitute a Board of Education of the

City of Brooklyn, and this was its creation. By the said statute the said board was given the control and direction of the Common Schools of Brooklyn and all of the powers under the general state school laws of trustees of school districts (who were thus locally done away with), but under and subject to rules and regulations not inconsistent with the said laws which the Common Council was required to make. The members of the Common Council were *ex officio* made school commissioners. The treasurer of the city was *ex officio* made custodian of the school moneys, but to the Board of Education was given the spending of the same. By Chapter 143 of the Laws of 1850 the whole city was made one school district for the purposes of taxation, the building and repairing of schools, and the support of the schools; but the Board of Education was directed to divide the city into districts for the purpose of regulating attendance. Reference to the duties of School Commissioners prescribed by the Revised Statutes will show that this transferred to the Board of Education all such duties, and thus the members of the Common Council ceased to be School Commissioners. This act also empowered the Board of Education to make rules for its own government, and for the government and discipline of the schools, thus taking that power from the Common Council.

“The foregoing acts, and several others which I do not need to cite, were not amendments to the charter of Brooklyn, but separate and distinct school laws. They cannot be construed as making the local system a part of the city corporation, but manifest a contrary purpose. . . . In the revised charter of Brooklyn, passed in 1873, it is provided as follows: ‘There shall be a department of public instruction which shall be under the control of a Board of Education, and all the provisions of law relating to the present Board of Education of the City of Brooklyn shall apply thereto, except

so much as relates to the appointment of members thereof,' and then it makes the change that the mayor shall appoint the members with the approval of the Common Council. This is all that act contains on the subject of education. It nominally created a department of public instruction, but puts it under the control of the Board of Education, which was, and always has been, a corporate entity itself, having a treasury, and capable of holding property, of contracting, and of suing and being sued. . . ."

These positions are reaffirmed in the famous case of *Gunnison v. the Board of Education of the City of New York* (176 N. Y. 13). In its decision handed down on October 6, 1903, the Court of Appeals held:

"It is apparent from the general drift of the argument that the learned counsel for the defendants is of the opinion that the employment of the teachers in the public schools, and the general conduct and management of the schools, is a city function in the same sense as it is in the care of the streets, or the employment of police, and the payment of their salaries and compensation; but that view of the relations of the city to public education, if entertained, is an obvious mistake. The city cannot rent, build, or buy a school house. It cannot employ or discharge a teacher, and has no power to contract with teachers with respect to their compensation. There is no contract or official relation, express or implied, between the teachers and the city. All this results from the settled policy of the state from an early date to divorce the business of public education from all other municipal interests or business, and to take charge of it, as a peculiar and separate function, through agents of its own selection, and immediately subject and responsive to its own control. . . .

"The defendant is, by the terms of the new charter, given all the powers, and subjected to all the obligations

and duties of all previous boards of education (Sec. 1058). It is expressly required to administer all money raised for educational purposes (1060). . . .

"If the state has departed from the settled policy that has prevailed since its organization of keeping the work of public education, and the control and management of its schools, separate and distinct from all other municipal interests and business by the selection of its own agents, and clothing them with corporate powers to represent the schools, such as school districts and boards of education, and has devolved these powers and duties directly upon the city, we would naturally expect to find such a departure and notable change expressed in language so clear that no doubt would arise as to this change of policy. . . . If the board cannot be sued for teachers' wages and the teachers must resort to a suit against the city, then surely the board must have sunk into a mere city agency, and it no longer has any use for independent corporate powers. Public education then becomes a city function, exposed to the taint of current municipal politics and to any and every mismanagement that may prevail in city departments. But we still have the very plain provisions of the charter that the board is the representative of the entire school system, and has the power to administer all school funds, and is vested with the right to manage and control all school property. . . . We have seen that the policy of this state for more than half a century has been to separate public education from all other municipal functions, and intrust it to independent corporate agencies of its own creation, such as school districts and boards of education, with capacity to sue and be sued in all matters involved in the exercise of their corporate powers. We have seen that during this long period of time this court and all the courts of this state have accepted this rule and acted upon it. . . .

"The other provision of the present charter, which it

is said is new, and makes a radical change with respect to the proper party defendant in such actions as this, is to be found in Section 96, where the administrative departments of the city are enumerated. The Board of Education is there called the 'Department of education,' and the head of the department is to be called the Board of Education, and shall consist of forty-six members (Section 108). It is difficult to see how the mere listing of the Board of Education among the city departments makes any change in its corporate powers, duties, or liabilities. . . . It is still the sole representative of the school system, with exclusive powers to control, manage and administer all school property and school funds. If enumerating the board as a corporate body among the departments did not make it any greater than before, it certainly could not make it any less. . . . Moreover, the provision was not new. The Board of Education was made a city department by the Charter of 1873, and under the charter of Brooklyn. . . ."

Again, at the beginning of the opinion the Court held:

"The City Charter provides that the defendant, the Board of Education, shall administer all moneys available for educational purposes, and on the facts stated in the complaint, and admitted in the demurrer, it is clear that the plaintiff cannot maintain any action against the city. The mere fact that the public money for the support and conduct of the schools is deposited in the city treasury does not affect the liability of the Board of Education to be sued, nor does it, upon the facts stated, create any liability against the city. The city has the custody of the money, but the board must administer and expend all school funds as the representative of the school system, and the financial officer of the city cannot pay out any part of these funds except upon the order and audit of the board. In most of the other counties of the state the county treasurer, or some

county or town officer, has the custody of the school fund, but it cannot be paid out or disbursed except upon the order or audit of the trustees of the proper school district, and these districts are declared to be corporate bodies, thus giving them the power of independent action (Laws of 1894, Chap. 556, Art. VI, sections 42, 43, 44). So, in the City of New York, the city of its own motion has no power to expend or pay out any part of the school funds for the payment of teachers."

The schools of any locality are a part of the state school system, not local schools. The officers who administer and supervise them are state, and not local, officers. In the case of the People *ex rel. v. Bennett* (54 Barbour, 480), the court held that the members of the Board of Education of Saratoga Springs and the trustees of school districts within that village are neither county, city, town or village officers within the meaning of Section 2 of Article 10 of the State Constitution in existence at that time.

Governor Hughes, in his message of May 29, 1907, vetoing the equal salary bill, referred to the legal status of the Board of Education of New York City as follows:

"Apart from the power of the mayor to appoint and remove, as stated, and the duty of the city to supply the funds required, the Board of Education exercises its powers independently. It is not subject to control by the city authorities. There is no contract or official relation between the teachers and the city. The city cannot be sued upon the contracts made by the board. This results, as the Court of Appeals has said, from 'the settled policy of the state, from an early date, to divorce the business of public education from all other municipal interests or business, and from the creation of the board as a corporate body to conduct a system of public education in a designated division of the state, and manage and control the schools therein.'"

As corroborating evidence that the Board of Education is a state, and not a municipal, body it is a matter of common knowledge that the charter prepared for New York City and introduced in the legislature, commonly known as the Foley bill (No. 2596), contained a distinct provision (Sec. 480) to make the department of education of that city a separate and distinct department of the city government. It would not have been necessary to incorporate this provision if the school system were not conceded to be part of the school system of the state and not a local system.

CONTROL OVER STATE SYSTEM OF COMMON SCHOOLS VESTED IN THE COMMISSIONERS OF EDUCATION

The state of New York has provided for the supervision and general control of its common school system, first, through the Secretary of State, then through the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and now through the Commissioner of Education. A similar method of supervision prevails generally throughout the United States.

“Controlling in a general way the discipline and the management of the common schools throughout the state will be found a State Superintendent of Public Instruction, or an officer under some other title, performing the duties indicated. Or, to state the proposition differently, the general supervision of the schools is usually vested in a State Superintendent” (Abbott’s *Municipal Corporations*, vol. 3, Par. 1076, citing *Wiley v. Alleghany Co. School Com.*, 51 Md. 401; *Jones v. Benton*, 49 Greene, 40. *State v. Albertson*, 54 N. J. Law, 72; *Kirnbough v. Barnett*, 93 Tex. 301).

The Education Law of 1910 (L. 1910, ch. 140) contains the following provisions as to the supervisory control of the Commissioner of Education over the common schools of the state:

(1) The Commissioner of Education is the chief executive officer of the "state system of education." "He shall enforce *all general and special laws* relating to the educational system of the state, and execute all educational policies determined upon by the board of regents" (Education Law, Par. 94, subd. 1).

The Education Department is under the legislative direction of the regents and the *executive direction of the Commissioner of Education*. The Education Department "is charged with the general management and supervision of all public schools, and all of the educational work of the state, including the operations of the University of the State of New York" (Education Law, Par. 20).

The "educational system" referred to above includes the "system of common schools" required under the constitution. The Commissioner of Education must enforce "all general and special laws" relating to such schools. This applies to the charters of the several cities, and is a further recognition of the doctrine that the administration of the schools of a city is distinct and separable from other municipal functions. The present New York City Charter, Par. 1061, gives to the Board of Education the general management and control of the "public schools and the public school system of the city," "subject only to the general statutes of the state relating to public schools and public school instruction." When this section is construed with paragraphs 20 and 94, subd. 1, of the Education Law, it must be concluded that the Board of Education of New York City exercises its power of "general management and control" subject to the supervisory control and management of the Commissioner of Education.

(2) The Commissioner of Education has "general supervision over all schools and institutions which are subject to the provisions of this act, or of any statute relating to education, and shall cause the same to be

examined and inspected, and shall advise and guide the school officers of all districts and cities of the state in relation to their duties and the general management of the schools under their control" (Education Law, Par. 94, subd. 2).

This is the provision which confers upon the Commissioner his general supervisory, visitatorial and advisory power in respect to school management. It is broad and inclusive, and pertains to schools under the general laws and those under any other law, meaning, of course, city schools under city charters.

In respect to this provision the Court of Appeals has said, in the case of *O'Connor v. Hendrick*, 184 N. Y. 421: "While it is true that there is no express grant of authority to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (now the Commissioner of Education) in the consolidated school law to establish regulations as to the management of the common schools, the existence of a general power of supervision on his part over such schools is clearly implied in many parts of the statute." It was thereupon held that reasonable regulations of the Commissioner were enforceable.

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to "annul, upon cause shown to his satisfaction, any certificate of qualification granted to a teacher *by any authority whatever*" (Education Law, Par. 94, subd. 7). This power is recognized in the New York Charter, Par. 1089.

Removal of school officers is authorized by the Commissioner of Education "whenever it shall be proved to his satisfaction" that a trustee, member of a Board of Education, or other school officer has been guilty of "any wilful violation or neglect of duty under this chapter, or any other act pertaining to common schools" (Education Law, Par. 95).

This power pertains to school officers in cities, although such officers have powers and duties especially prescribed by local city charter. It has been held that a statute giving

the State Superintendent general supervision of all departments of instruction *applies to a union free school district, created by special act of the legislature*; and where, by such statute, the Superintendent is given power to remove school officers for neglect of duty he may remove members of a Board of Education of such a district, although the special act creating the district gives the board entire management of all common schools therein (Matter of Light, 21 Misc. 737, 49 N. Y., Supp. 345 revd. on other grounds in 30 App. Div. 50).

The Commissioner of Education may decide appeals brought to him from official acts of boards of education in cities or union free school districts, although such boards are created by special law. An appeal may be brought from "any other official act or decision of any officer, school authorities, or meetings concerning any other matter under this chapter, or any other act pertaining to common schools" (Education Law, Par. 880, subd. 7).

This provision gives the Commissioner full power to review the official acts of the Board of Education of the City of New York. This power has been exercised in a number of cases and has been sustained by the courts (*People ex rel. Keyser v. Board of Education*, 32 Misc. 63); and so also in respect to acts of boards of education of other cities acting under special charters (*People ex rel. Walrath v. O'Brien*, 112 App. Div. 97).

The powers of the Commissioner of Education are so ample that in *Hutchinson v. Skinner* (21 Misc. 729), in which two members of a bi-partisan board of education created by the city charter of Watervliet, and which had been in a state of deadlock upon all questions relative to the employment of teachers, petitioned the State Superintendent for the removal of the other two members of the board; the Superintendent refused to remove, but made an order requiring the board to equip the schools and open them on a day which he named; the board did not comply with this order and the State Superintendent made an

22 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

order appointing temporarily a full corps of teachers and employees at a rate of compensation fixed in the order. The court held that the State Superintendent had the power to make such an order so that he might "give effect to his decision" as authorized by the Education Law (881, subd. 4).

CHAPTER III

THE SITUATION AT PRESENT IN NEW YORK

“THE policy of this state for more than half a century,” which has been “to separate public education from all other municipal functions and intrust it to independent corporate agencies of its own creation,” is carried out neither in the letter nor in the spirit at the present time. The Board of Education is not “the sole representative of the school system with exclusive powers to control, manage, and administer all school property and school funds.” The counter-conception which the fiscal authorities of the city seem to hold is that the school system is in all respects a subordinate department of the city government. Through control of the public purse they have given authority to their views. In effect the schools have been almost as completely annexed to the City Hall as they would have been if the proposed new charter had become the organic law of the city. This change in the status of the school department has been a gradual one, but it has been so thorough as to effect a new method of school administration. A system of fiscal administration has been building itself up without, we think, due regard for the educational and legal requirements of the schools.

The power of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to regulate the expenditures of the city is undoubtedly very great. A tendency to centralize all municipal activities and business is, perhaps, inherent in its work. This tendency has been felt by the Board of Education for some time, but with increasing force from year to year.

Section 1075 of the charter directs that "the Board of Education shall provide for the purchase of all books, apparatus, stationery, and other things necessary and expedient to enable the schools of the city to be properly and successfully conducted. It shall cause to be furnished all necessary supplies. . . ." But no funds are granted to the board to provide for the lighting of school buildings, on the theory that the lighting of school buildings pertains to the jurisdiction of the Commission of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity.

Section 1066 declares that the Board of Education "shall have power to lease property required for the purpose of furnishing school accommodations, and to prepare and execute leases therefor," and Section 1064 declares that "the Board of Education shall administer all moneys appropriated or available for educational purposes in the City of New York. . . ." Yet, since 1909, the control of the funds for the rental of school premises has been diverted from the Board of Education to the Department of Finance; and the responsibility for leasing properties for school purposes has been given to the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, by whom the Board of Education is notified, in common with all heads of departments, officers, boards, and commissions, "that applications for the renewal of leases to the city should be made to the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund. . . ." (*Journal*, Board of Education, 1910; 408).

Section 1073 reads: "All plans for new school buildings, for additions to school buildings, and for structural changes in old buildings shall be passed upon and must be approved by the superintendent of school buildings, who shall submit such plans to the Board of Education, whose action thereon shall be final." But on July 17, 1911, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment reported a resolution that all boards, departments, bureaus, commissioners, or officers of the city or county government authorized by it to incur obligations and execute contracts payable out of corporate

stock be, and they are hereby directed, to submit to this board for approval plans, specifications, and estimates of cost prior to advertising for bids.

Section 1060 of the charter directs that "all moneys raised for educational purposes in the City of New York shall be raised in two funds, to be known as the special school fund and the general school fund." The general fund is for the payment of the salaries of teachers, superintendents, etc. The special school fund includes all moneys raised for educational purposes not comprised in the general school fund. "The general school fund shall be raised in bulk, and for the city at large." "It shall be the duty of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and of the Board of Aldermen to indicate in the budget in raising the special fund the respective amounts thereof which shall be available for use in the several boroughs." Although the charter says specifically that the general school fund shall be raised *in bulk*, the records of the Board of Education show that the Board of Estimate and Apportionment has for some years practiced the habit of recommending the manner in which it should be apportioned, and in the budgets for 1911 and 1912 it took upon itself the apportioning said general fund, conditioning its extra allowance of money in excess of the three mill tax upon the acceptance by the Board of Education of the apportionment which it made. In apportioning the special school fund it not only indicated the amounts which should be available for use in the several boroughs, as the charter directs, but subdivided these amounts into some ninety-nine different funds, which it set apart for specific uses. Quite apart from legal warrant for such procedure, it creates a circumlocution device for school administration which tends to paralyze the public business and almost to defeat the objects for which the Board of Education was created. It tends to reduce the administration of the schools and the energy of the general staff, in large part, to the routine work of continually requesting the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to transfer

money from one fund to another in order to meet the readjustments required in the school service. It thus tends to prevent the transaction of public business.

Section 56 of the charter makes it the duty of the Board of Aldermen, upon the recommendation of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, to fix the salary of every officer or person whose compensation is paid out of the city treasury, other than day laborers, and teachers, examiners, and members of the supervising staff of the Department of Education. The Court of Appeals in *Hogan v. Board of Education*, decided on January 10, 1911, held: "It seems clear that by the changes made in the present provisions the legislature intended to remove all possible uncertainty on this subject, and, while securing to the Department of Education the unquestioned right to fix the compensation of certain of its employees, to confer with equal clearness upon the Board of Aldermen the general power to fix the compensation of those not included in the specified exceptions." This is good law, but it is not good administration. This provision of the charter divides and separates functions which, for the proper discharge of duty, belong together. It entrusts an important and necessary function of the Board of Education to another agency, and puts the responsibility for the proper discharge of this function upon the body which is farthest away from the detail of operation and least familiar with its routine, making it decide what the necessities of the work require. There is pressing need for an immediate revision of the charter at this point, as the present provision prevents the keeping of the schools clean, hinders the necessary work in the school offices, and has, through the needless routine which it necessitates, cost the city something like a hundred thousand dollars through mistakes already made in fixing the salaries in the general offices of one department, as is pointed out in Chapter XII of this report.

The legal warrant for the other features outlined above, of the present method of controlling the appropriations for

educational purposes, is by no means so clear. There is an evident conflict between the statutory power of the two boards which has resulted in a grievous confusion in the functions of school administration. The Board of Estimate and Apportionment has the undoubted right to require the Board of Education to conform to provisions of the charter relative to the submission of estimates and disbursements of city funds which do not interfere with or limit the exclusive control of educational matters conferred by the charter upon the Board of Education. This arrangement is due to the fact that the Board of Education may not of itself raise or hold public money, but is dependent in this respect upon the financial machinery of the city. What is most urgently needed by the City of New York at the present time is a clear definition of the law that controls the relations of the fiscal department of the city and the Board of Education. Until this is made by the courts, the administration of the schools is bound to be in continual confusion. When it is made, it will doubtless be necessary to appeal to the legislature for aid in perfecting the details of a proper system of school administration. That the many-headed system made up of the various branches of the city government in constant struggle with the Board of Education as to what the law is, and what must and must not be done, is thoroughly incompetent to administer the schools of the leading city of the nation is all too evident.

A single illustration as to the way the school business is, and must be, done at present will suffice. Others might be given which abound in even greater routine and postpone final action to an even more remote period from its inception. This one will serve to show the circumlocution features of the system, and at the same time to raise the question as to the legal necessity of such a confusion of authority and time-consuming routine. The following is the formula for the leasing of premises for school purposes which the Superintendent of School Buildings must observe :

NEW LEASES FOR PREMISES

Initiative

The initial information regarding premises to be leased for the purposes of the Department of Education is derived from many sources:

A. *First.* From reports or recommendations made by any one of the local school boards (Chap. 466, Sec. 1088).

Second. From members of the Board of Education.

Third. From district superintendents or members of the supervising staff (principals, etc.).

Fourth. From local civic associations, boards of trade.

Fifth. From private citizens or owners of property.

Sixth. By inspections made by the building bureau of the Department of Education.

B. In the case of additional accommodations for high or training schools, from the Committee on High Schools and Training Schools (By-laws, Sec. 21, Par. 6).

C. In the case of space required for the use of the Bureau of Supplies for storage purposes, or by any of the bureaus for administrative offices, from the bureau which is in need.

NEW LEASES FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PURPOSES

Preliminary Investigation

Upon receipt by the Bureau of Buildings of a recommendation, suggestion, or offer to lease property, a blank form is forwarded from that office to the Deputy Superintendent of School Buildings of the borough in which it may be located, and an inspection and report are made. This report gives the location, number of class rooms obtainable; size of same, their capacity and seating accommodation; dimensions of the building and material, number and height of stories, method of heating; also a statement of what alterations are necessary to fit it for school use; their esti-

mated cost, and whether the owner will make same or no; the name and address of the owner; the rental asked; what repairs the owner will make during the lease; whether light, heat and janitor's services are included in the rental asked; details as to condition of heating and sanitary apparatus; the assessed valuation, and any pertinent matters not specifically listed. This report is made by an inspector of the Bureau of Buildings to the Deputy Superintendent, who endorses thereon his opinion as to whether the premises are suitable for school purposes or no, and whether the rent asked is, or is not, reasonable. This report is returned to the main office of the Bureau of Buildings.

Certificate from City Superintendent of Schools

On the receipt of the report on the premises, if they are or can be made suitable for school purposes, the Bureau of Buildings requests the City Superintendent to forward to it his recommendations as to the necessity for additional school accommodations in the neighborhood in question (By-laws, Bd. of Ed., Sec. 16, Sec. 3). At times when it is evident that the proposed premises will be physically suitable, this request is made coincidentally with the request for the inspection heretofore referred to.

Adverse Report from City Superintendent

Should the City Superintendent state that the accommodations offered, for any reason, are unnecessary a report is presented by the Bureau of Buildings to the Committee on Buildings stating that fact, and suggesting that the proposition be denied, and that due notice be sent to those interested.

Favorable Report from City Superintendent

On receipt of a recommendation from the City Superintendent that the premises be leased the Bureau of Buildings then requests the Superintendent of Buildings for the

borough concerned, and also the Sanitary Superintendent of the Department of Health, and, in some cases, the Fire Commissioner, to make an inspection of the premises proposed to be leased (By-laws, Bd. of Ed., Sec. 16, Sec. 3), and, if same are found suitable for school purposes, to issue to this department a certificate as to that fact.

Search of Title

At the same time a request is made on the Counsel to the Corporation that he certify to the Bureau of Buildings information regarding the "owner of record" of the property in question.

Certificates

The inspections of the Bureau of Buildings and the Department of Health being made, reports from each are received, and, if satisfactory, are noted and held with the papers in the case.

Objections

It often happens that objections are filed on account of inadequate exits, leaky roofs and leaders, defective or inadequate plumbing, plastering, or what not, and, on receipt of these, they are taken up with the owner of the property and an agreement reached as to their correction. This work sometimes takes several weeks.

Reinspection

A reinspection is requested, made, and another report received.

Negotiations with Owner

Meantime negotiations have been under way with the owner as to the terms, covering rental, length of term, partial or complete occupancy, taxes, water rates, light, heat, janitor's services, etc., and the checking up of the rental with that paid for like accommodations in other localities of the borough.

Report to Committee on Buildings

When all these details have been satisfactorily arranged, and the certificates obtained, a report is prepared by the Superintendent of Buildings to the Committee on Buildings rehearsing in detail all the various clauses and terms as agreed upon, together with all the correspondence and papers, and it is suggested that a report be presented to the Board of Education recommending that a lease be made in accordance therewith.

Report to Board of Education

If the terms as submitted are approved by the Committee on Buildings, a report and resolution is prepared for adoption by the Board of Education requesting that the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund authorize the Board of Education to make a lease in accordance with the terms as agreed upon by the Department of Education, and copies of the certificates are attached and forwarded with the request.

Department of Finance

The matter is then referred to the Comptroller of the City of New York, who, through the Bureau of Real Estate of his office examines the property and presents a report thereon to the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, setting forth his opinion as to whether or not the action proposed will be for the best interests of the city.

Commissioners of the Sinking Fund

If favorable, the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund adopt a resolution authorizing the Board of Education to enter into a lease on the terms which may be contained in their resolution. It sometimes happens that the length of the term, or some other detail, is altered, but that resolution governs.

Notice to Board of Education

The Secretary of the Sinking Fund Commission then transfers to the Secretary of the Board of Education a certified copy of the action taken by the commission in the matter.

It does not follow that the investigation by the Comptroller is always favorable to the proposition as prepared by the Building Department of the Board of Education, and, in that event, a conference is usually had between the Bureau of Real Estate of the Department of Finance and a representative of the Bureau of School Buildings preliminary to the preparation of the Comptroller's report. If possible, such explanations are made as will remove the objections which may be raised. Otherwise, an adverse report is made by him, and the request of the Board of Education denied. In that event negotiations must be begun *de novo* with the owner.

Preparation of Lease

Authority having been granted, the Secretary prepares the leases for signature and they are then forwarded to the office of the Counsel to the Corporation for inspection and the endorsement thereon of his *approval as to form*. This done, they are returned to the Secretary of the Board of Education, who *notifies the lessor* to appear at his office and *execute the document*, five copies being prepared.

Copies Sent

After execution the originals are retained by the Secretary of the Board of Education and the owner or lessor, and copies sent to the Comptroller, the Auditor of the Board of Education, and the Bureau of School Buildings.

NEW LEASES FOR HIGH OR TRAINING SCHOOL PURPOSES

Except for the earliest stages, the procedure heretofore set forth is followed:

Initiative

The initial step is taken by the Committee on High Schools and Training Schools, and usually takes the form of a report to the Board of Education (By-laws, Bd. of Ed., Sec. 21, Sec. 2), calling attention to the necessity of additional accommodations, and a suggestion that certain premises may be available.

References to Committee on Buildings

This is referred to the Committee on Buildings, and by it to the Bureau of School Buildings, where it takes the usual course.

Certificates

The resolution of the Committee on High Schools and Training Schools then takes the place of the recommendation of the City Superintendent of Schools (By-laws, Bd. of Ed., Sec. 16, Sec. 2). The physical examinations as to suitability are all conducted or initiated by the Bureau of School Buildings.

LEASES OF PROPERTY FOR OFFICES, OR OF SITES ON WHICH
TEMPORARY BUILDINGS ARE ERECTED

In these cases it is not necessary to obtain certificates from the Bureau of Buildings or the Department of Health; otherwise, the procedure is as heretofore outlined.

RENEWALS OF LEASES

Policy as to Term

It is the policy of the Board of Education, as adopted by its Committee on Buildings, not to lease premises for

school purposes for a term longer than two years, and to obtain, wherever possible, a privilege of renewal for either one or two years thereafter. This is rendered quite necessary because of the fact that great shifts of population or changes in the character of a neighborhood occur, making it absolutely impossible to predict or foresee the length of time the premises may be needed; therefore, the short-term rule.

Date of Expiration

It is also the rule to make the date of expiration either February 1st or July 1st, for the reason:

First, that the school terms end at those dates and the discontinuance of the lease will be least disturbing then; and

Second, that the new buildings which are under way are usually ready for occupancy at, or near, the beginning of the school term.

Preparation for Renewals

Owing to the many steps which have to be taken preparatory to the execution of a lease, or the renewal of an existent one, a card index is kept in the office of the Secretary of the Board of Education, and in the Bureau of Buildings, showing the various dates of expiration of leases, and the Committee on Buildings has directed the Secretary of the Board of Education to send a communication in writing to this bureau six months prior to the date of expiration of any lease, giving notice of that fact. At that time the recommendation of the City Superintendent of Schools is requested, and the same procedure in all respects is followed as though the matter were a new lease.

Office Method

The matter of the negotiations for premises and all the details attendant thereto, have, by direction of the Committee on Buildings, been assigned to one of the staff of the Superintendent of School Buildings as a portion of his duties.

Repairs and Alterations

In some cases it happens that extensive alterations, both structural and in the equipment of the premises sought to be leased, have to be made in order to make them acceptable to the various municipal authorities and to conform to their proposed use. Plans must be prepared, submitted to the Building Bureau, an approval obtained, and a contract let. If the changes include electric lighting work, etc., the approval of the plans by the Department of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity is a prerequisite, and its certificate must be obtained on completion of the work.

SOME DIFFICULTIES OF DOING BUSINESS IN THIS WAY

Subject: Leases

October 31, 1906.

HON. EGERTON L. WINTHROP, JR.,
President, Board of Education.

MY DEAR SIR, — The Board of Education has for some years leased for storage purposes the premises known as No. 426 East 110th street, Borough of Manhattan, but they have been entirely inadequate for some time and, on October 15th, 1906, the Committee on Buildings adopted resolutions:

First, abandoning, at the expiration of the present lease in January, 1907, the present storehouse, and

Second, recommending to the Board of Education that a lease be made of two lofts at Nos. 530-534 East 80th street, Borough of Manhattan, for a term of three years, etc., at an annual rental of \$3,200.00, the lessors being the Dry Dock Realty Company, Incorporated. A. Schwerer, Jr., secretary, of the aforesaid address.

These resolutions were reported to and passed by the Board of Education at its meeting held on the 24th instant, and, in the natural course of events, were forwarded to the Sinking Fund Commission.

The lessor has informed me that since the receipt of the copy of the resolution passed by the Board of Education he has been interviewed by a representative of the Comptroller's office who, he says, informed him in terms more forcible than elegant that the utmost rent that office would agree to is \$3,000.00 per annum, and, if that is not satisfactory, he gets nothing.

The owner assures me that since the negotiations between the Board of Education and this company have been in progress they have refused to consider offers to rent the premises, last week having had an offer for the two floors at \$3,500, and he desires to know exactly what position he is in. This matter of reduction in the rental is corroborated by information which I have received from other sources.

This is not an isolated case, and it has occasioned this department an unlimited amount of trouble and annoyance. I have, therefore, on behalf of the Committee on Buildings, thought it wise to bring this matter to your attention with a clear statement of the case, and, on its behalf, request that the matter be referred to the Committee on By-laws for an opinion as to the right and ability of the Board of Education, under the decision known as "the Gunnison decision," to direct its secretary to execute for and on behalf of the Board of Education such leases as it may deem wise to consummate without any reference of such matters to the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund for their action.

It would be of the greatest value if this matter could be considered and reported upon before the next meeting of the board in order that this particular case, which I have heretofore cited, may at that time be disposed of. I am, sir,

Very truly yours,

(Signed) RICH. H. ADAMS,

Chairman, Committee on Buildings.

LAW DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

NEW YORK, March 13, 1907.

HON. EGERTON L. WINTHROP,

President of the Board of Education.

SIR, — I am in receipt of your communication dated November 28, 1906, wherein you inquire as to whether or not the Board of Education has power to execute leases for property acquired for educational purposes independently of the action of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund.

I am of the opinion that Section 1066 of the Greater New York Charter confers ample powers upon the board for this purpose. That section distinctly states that the

“Board shall have power to lease property required for the purpose of furnishing school accommodations, and to prepare and execute leases therefor.”

I am aware that former Corporation Counsel Rives held that it was a debatable question whether or not the Board of Education had the authority to execute a lease for the purpose mentioned, and, in support of his contention, cited Section 96 of the charter, wherein the Board of Education was classified among the administrative departments of the City of New York. He claimed that, reading this section in conjunction with Section 217, which provides that all applications to lease real estate for the purposes of “The City of New York” should be considered by the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund. He concluded, therefore, that it was not entirely clear that Section 1066 gave the power about which you inquire.

Since this opinion was rendered the case of *Gunnison vs. The Board of Education*, 176 N. Y. 11, was decided, and holds that, while the Board of Education

is a department of the City of New York, yet, for the purpose of managing and directing its own internal affairs, it is an entity separate and distinct from the City of New York.

It can be thus readily seen that this case resolves the difficulty which perplexed Mr. Rives and it can, therefore, be said that the Board of Education may execute leases for educational purposes without the sanction or approbation of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund.

I am also aware that former Corporation Counsel Whalen maintained in June, 1898, that leases made by your department had to be approved by the above-mentioned commissioners. His opinion is easily understood when one bears in mind that it was rendered prior to the enactment of that portion of Section 1066, to which I have adverted above, giving the Board of Education power to prepare and *execute* leases.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) G. L. STERLING,
Acting Corporation Counsel.

March 27, 1907.

From the Secretary of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, certified copy of a preamble and resolution adopted March 20, 1907, as follows:

WHEREAS, The attention of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund has been called to the fact that the Corporation Counsel has rendered an opinion to the Board of Education, under date of March 13, 1907, advising that he is of the opinion Section 1066 of the Greater New York Charter confers ample powers upon the said board to execute leases for property acquired for educational purposes independently of the action of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund;

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education be and is

hereby requested to continue, notwithstanding the said opinion of the Corporation Counsel, to send their applications for leases to this board, as heretofore.

April 10, 1907.

TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION :

The Committee on By-laws and Legislation, to which was referred a preamble and resolution adopted by the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund on March 20, 1907 (see *Journal*, p. 525), requesting that, notwithstanding the opinion of the Corporation Counsel to the effect that the Board of Education has full power to negotiate and execute leases, applications for leases for the purposes of this department be sent to said commissioners as heretofore, respectfully reports that it has carefully considered the same and is of the opinion that there is no objection to submitting leases for educational purposes to the Sinking Fund Commissioners for their approval, provided said commissioners will act thereon without undue delay. It is the understanding of your committee that the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund desire to be kept informed regarding all leases of property for the purposes of the city, and there is no reason why the Board of Education should not cordially coöperate with them.

The following resolution is submitted for adoption :

RESOLVED, That all leases hereafter authorized by the Board of Education be submitted to the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund for their approval.

This resolution was adopted.

THIS METHOD OF MAKING LEASES AND THE TIME IT TAKES

The Board of Education of the City of New York has always possessed the powers and rights of a corporation, as established in the act of 1851, the consolidation act,

and in all later legislation down to the present charter; and has always had control of the funds which were raised and applicable for the purposes of public instruction in the City of New York up to 1910, when the Board of Estimate and Apportionment disallowed the request made by the Board of Education that there be included, as heretofore, in the annual budget a certain sum for the payment of rents, together with a provision for further leases which might become necessary during the coming year. At the same time the Board of Estimate and Apportionment established a new fund from which the expense of leases for premises for city purposes was to be defrayed, and put the same in the care and control of the Department of Finance, which department now administers it.

It is well to consider the many stages through which a proposition to lease premises for school purposes must go, and the consequent length of time consumed thereby. The procedure seems to be not only of doubtful legal warrant, but, as it results in delays, duplication of work, and serious detriment to the business of the Board of Education, it certainly is not based on sound principles of administration. Indeed, this method of administering the schools by the diffusion of authority over them to many boards and city departments can hardly be improved upon as a means for defeating the ends for which a school system exists. There are so many heads to the business that a great many people are sure to be kept busy by it; and so many officers who must be consulted that it is certain that responsibility for mistakes can never possibly be fastened upon the man who made them. Moreover, if there is energy or originality in any branch of the service, a desire for improvement, or a knowledge of how to better the work by reorganizing it in a particular department, it is sure to be crushed out by the hopelessness which comes from thinking of the number of steps which must be taken, and the number of lukewarm and indifferent individuals who must be roused to life before anything can be done. This is what is called a bu-

reaucracy; and its method of administration is bureaucratic, or one which, having lapsed into something of less than human vitality and concern, answers all questions and makes all decisions by referring them to somebody else; and he refers them to another; such a bureaucracy concerns itself solely with winding and unwinding the tape which prevents it from taking action and confines it to a perpetual referring of matters which affect its functions. The more times a matter has to be referred from one agency to another the greater is the inevitableness of mistake; and when so many laws, ordinances, by-laws, and regulations govern the performance of any work, the constant change in their interpretation or application, the issuance of new regulations and interpretations, and the wiping out of old ones, and the repeated and re-repeated duplication of inspection and approval of the same items, produce a confusion and a weariness in administration which deadens it. There is an abundance of these conditions in the administration of the schools of New York City, as this report shows.

CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECT OF THE METHOD UPON EDUCATION

IT TAKES THE CONTROL OF THE SCHOOLS AWAY FROM
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

TAKING away the control or administration of educational affairs from the Board of Education has, in effect, made various other boards and officials regard themselves as commissioned to conduct the educational affairs of the city. The Board of Aldermen by official action (see the minutes of the Board of Education for 1910 and 1911) has frequently taken upon itself the duty of requesting or recommending to the Board of Education what action it should take in matters which are purely educational in their character, and the decision of which is expressly with the Board of Education only. Such official action of the Aldermen has concerned the locating of schools, the renting of buildings, the establishing of high schools, the appointment of teachers, the fixing of the course of study, and the printing of school books in union shops, — matters all of them which, by no possible construction of law, is it the duty of the Board of Aldermen to decide.

It is well known that the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, by controlling the appropriations of the Board of Education and making them in specific funds set apart for specific purposes, in effect administers the school affairs of the city, deciding and determining what subjects shall be taught, what supplies shall be furnished, what enlargements and improvements shall be made, and, if it wishes, to stop progress and effectual education, rendering the Board of

Education a mere rubber stamp in its scheme of school administration. Some of its members feel called upon to suggest the kind of educational records which shall be kept and to interfere with the educational economy of the system.

One illustration is significant:

LAW DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

NEW YORK, February 7, 1911.

HON. EGERTON L. WINTHROP, JR.,
Normal College, New York City.

DEAR SIR, — I received your letter, dated February 1, 1911, in which you requested my opinion regarding two questions to which I shall presently advert.

It appears that on April 27, 1910, the Board of Trustees of the Normal College adopted a resolution to take effect May 1, 1910, fixing the minimum salaries of the women professors at \$3,000, with annual increments of \$200 until the maximum of \$4,000 shall have been reached and fixing the minimum salaries of the men professors at \$4,750 a year; with annual increments of \$250 until the maximum of \$6,000 shall have been reached. The resolution also provided that no increase should be paid unless it was approved by the Executive Committee, which was given the further power to make allowance for prior experience.

Acting under that resolution the Executive Committee met on May 10, 1910, and adopted a schedule of salaries to go into effect on May 15, 1910. That schedule established the compensation of ten professors of either sex, which, in no instance, exceeded the maxima above mentioned, and which was apparently based upon the prior experience of each individual specified in the schedule. The Board of Estimate and Apportionment, in making up the budget for the year 1911, included a schedule of the teaching force, and the sala-

ries of the ten professors above mentioned were placed at amounts which were paid to them prior to May 15, 1910, the date on which the schedule adopted by the Executive Committee became operative. The sum appropriated for the Normal College is sufficient to pay the salaries as fixed by the Board of Trustees, and you ask me to give you my opinion concerning two questions, as follows:

First: Has the Board of Trustees the power to fix the salaries of the teaching staff?

Second: Is the Board of Trustees bound, as long as it has sufficient funds, to pay the professors, instructors, tutors, and teachers the salaries which have been fixed by its by-laws?

I shall answer your questions separately and in the order in which they were asked.

I think that the Board of Trustees has the power to fix the salaries of the members of the teaching corps of the Normal College. According to Section 56 of the Revised Charter, the Board of Aldermen has the power to fix the compensation of all public employees, except day laborers, teachers, examiners, and members of the supervising staff in the Department of Education. The Normal College is, of course, a corporation separate from the Board of Education, but the statutory provisions regulating both bodies are found in the Educational Chapter of the Revised Charter, showing that they are a part of the Department of Education, and, hence, that they have the power to fix the salaries of their teaching forces. Furthermore, Section 1091 explicitly gives the Board of Education the power to fix the salaries of its teachers, and Section 1145, defining the powers of the Board of Trustees of the Normal College, says:

“The moneys apportioned to the Board of Education of said City of New York by the Board of Estimate

and Apportionment and Board of Aldermen for the payment of the salaries of the professors and officers of said college . . . shall be expended for said Normal College of the City of New York with the same right, power, and authority as if the said college were under the control of the Board of Education of the City of New York."

These provisions seem to give the Board of Trustees the same power to fix the salaries of the members of its teaching staff as the Board of Education, and concededly that power of fixation has been given to the latter body.

Respecting the second question contained in your letter, I would advise you that, in my opinion, professors, instructors, tutors, and others of the Normal College are entitled to be paid at the rates specified by the Board of Trustees. As I have above pointed out, the Board of Trustees has the power to fix their salaries, and, as long as they remain fixed by the by-laws at a given amount, they must be paid, especially since funds sufficient to pay them are available.

Yours truly,

(Signed) G. L. STERLING,
Acting Corporation Counsel.

Ordered to be printed in the minutes and filed.

From the Secretary of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, transmitting certified copies of resolutions adopted on February 9, 1911, as follows:

(a) RESOLVED, That in view of the opinion of the Corporation Counsel to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Normal College, under date of February 7, 1911, the salary schedules of the teaching force of the Normal College and the College of the City of New York, as fixed by the budget for 1911, be held in abeyance for the months of January, February, and March,

and for each of those months the Comptroller shall pay not more than one-twelfth for the Normal College and not more than one-tenth for the College of the City of New York, of the total amount allowed for the salaries of the teaching force of these institutions in the budget for the present year.

(b) RESOLVED, That the representatives of the Normal College and the College of the City of New York be requested to confer with the representatives of the Comptroller, and to agree, if possible, on a schedule of salaries for the teaching force in these two institutions which shall be acceptable to the colleges and to the Comptroller, for submission to this board in time for use in the preparation and audit of the payrolls in question for the month of April.

Ordered to be printed in the minutes and filed.

THE EFFECT UPON THE SCHOOLS OF THE PRESENT METHOD OF APPROPRIATING MONEY

The method of appropriating money for purposes of public education is a subject of grave concern to all citizens who are interested in the welfare of the young. The method of making appropriations which is now employed, that of creating a great number of funds for specific purposes, would not, we think, be employed were the fiscal authorities of the city familiar with the routine of school requirements and the changing nature of school conditions. This arrangement puts planning and accounting first, and assumes that the Board of Education can prepare and submit an estimate on or before the 15th day of September each year, which must, therefore, be based upon conditions as they existed up to the end of the previous school year, which will contain an anticipation of its needs from six to eighteen months beyond the time of its preparation. This estimate must be so exact that the Board of Education can wisely be com-

pelled to conduct the school business strictly in accordance with this statement of anticipated needs as it stands after it has been cut and reduced in such particulars as the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the Board of Aldermen may select for total or partial elimination. The responsible managers of a business undertaking can plan the conduct of their business during the coming year with a reasonable certainty that they need not set apart more than so much for operation, maintenance, or construction; but even with them foresight is not equal to aftersight, and emergencies like fire, flood, and strike may require them to reconstruct the budget that they have made for themselves in the quickest possible time to handle the situations which confront them. Again, no one would think of requiring a general in the field to conduct his campaign according to a budgetary arrangement based upon prophecy which limited him to just so much for each detail of his army's expense. Now, of these two kinds of undertaking, the work of a school system is more like that of the general conducting a campaign than like a business the needs of which are relatively determinable in detail a year in advance. The school department must meet conditions not of its own making; growth of population, change of population, variation in school attendance because of hard times or good times, unforeseen liabilities created by new laws, ordinances, or regulations enacted by other public bodies, and other emergencies due to a variety of causes.

A school system operating over so large an area and attempting to shape itself daily to meet the educational needs of so vast a population should control its own internal economy with at least the freedom that makes for good educational service. With a special school fund subdivided into ninety-nine distinct allowances for definite purposes, each of which it must employ for the preëstablished purpose and for no other, permission to supplement money from a fund where it is not so badly needed to one that needs it more being difficult to obtain and frequently non-

obtainable, the school system can hardly do its work. When it is remembered that there were changes within the system to the number of 1,624 classes in the year 1910, and to the number of 2,513 classes in the year 1911, the need for considerable flexibility in adjustment will be apparent. The school administration must meet emergencies every day. Its financial program must not be arranged in detail for it unless it is to be made unresponsive to the growth of unpredictable needs on the part of the public. To take away from it the possibility of modified plans, the function of initiating improved ways and means, and of expanding and bettering its service, is to cripple it without reason. It must have plans, and it must make estimates, but for budgetary purposes they should be general plans not minutely detailed and exact ones, and its appropriations should be made to it in undivided funds, with which it should be free to do the best it can to meet the unpredictable necessities of its work.

As an instance of the difficulty which the Board of Education meets in anticipating its needs in advance, many illustrations of which might be furnished, the following is typical. Pursuant to the action of the Board of Education taken on March 29, 1911, a request was made for funds to erect a building of twelve class rooms at 207th St., Perry and Hull avenues, there being at P. S. 8, Manhattan, 1,159 in average attendance and 694 on part time. The section grew with startling vigor, new apartment buildings were erected, and a number of two-family houses were built. It became necessary on November 8, 1911, for the Committee on Buildings to revise its plans completely, and, for the relief of this section, to recommend the construction of a new building with twenty-six class rooms and an assembly room, instead of the twelve-room building previously recommended. Such necessities for changes in plan are repeatedly occurring. It is impossible for human foresight accurately to anticipate them.

INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS

There is abundant evidence too scattered through its journals of a serious crippling of the activities of the Board of Education because of insufficient appropriations for school purposes. A few illustrations taken at random from the many which might be quoted from the journals, and from the vastly greater number of needs which never got a place in the records, are as follows:

On February 7th, 1910, the Board of Education directed its auditor to prepare and audit vouchers on account of the compensation of janitors for the year 1910 based upon the usual schedule rates, but from allowances of \$5,000 and over to deduct 10 per cent; of \$4,000 to \$5,000, 8 per cent; of \$3,000 to \$4,000, 6 per cent; of \$2,000 to \$3,000, 4 per cent; of \$1,000 to \$2,000, 2 per cent. Substantially the same deduction was again ordered on January 4th for 1911, with the exception that nothing was taken from grades of compensation less than \$2,000 in amount, though subsequently the Board of Estimate and Apportionment asked that no deduction be made and promised relief.

March 3. — The principal of the Harlem Evening High School for Women requested that one of the elevators of the school be operated. Request denied for lack of funds.

March 17. — The Committee on Vocational Schools and Industrial Training ordered that the attention of the Care of Schools Committee be called to a communication from Associate City Superintendent Straubenmüller relative to the need of a night watchman at the Manhattan Trade School for Girls. On motion it was ordered that the committee be informed that this committee has no funds with which to pay for the services of a watchman at this time.

April 12, 1911. — The Superintendent of Buildings recommended the advisability of providing metal cans for waste paper in school buildings. The Building Committee recommended this improvement against danger from fire to the

Supply Committee. It replied that it had no funds at its disposal for the purchase of metal cans.

A letter from Associate Superintendent Shallow, under date of May 6, 1911:

I beg to report as follows: The Board of Education asked for the sum of \$122,187.50 for the payment of attendance officers' salaries during the year 1911. This was the amount necessary to pay the officers in the employ of the Board of Education at the present time, the salaries to which they are entitled under a salary schedule adopted by the Board of Education on May 8, 1907. The amount designated by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for this purpose is \$4,697.66 less than the amount asked for. It appears that the Board of Estimate and Apportionment has cut off the amount estimated for so-called automatic increments of salary under the attendance officers' schedule referred to. The attendance officers have a right to expect that the schedule salaries will be paid to them, as this arrangement is in the nature of a contract between the Board of Education and the officers. The increase of an officer's salary depends upon approval of services by the Board of Superintendents.

June 2. — A request that caretakers of athletic fields be paid for their Sunday afternoon services. Ordered that the Committee on Athletics be informed that nothing can be done in this matter owing to the shortage in the appropriation entitled "Compensation of Janitors," account of 1911.

June 9. — New work shops are ready to be opened in Public School 1, Brooklyn, and a new kindergarten in Public School 33, Brooklyn. The funds on hand will not permit the furnishing of supplies for these work shops and this kindergarten.

June 9. — Matter of compensation of Patrick Dowd, janitor of Public School 158, Manhattan, for caring for the

assembly room and gymnasium in said school building when used by the evening recreation center. Ordered to be placed on file owing to the present shortage in the appropriation entitled "Compensation of Janitors, account of 1911."

June 22. — Principal of Public School 169, Manhattan, asks for an additional allowance for his school. The Committee replies it has no available funds, saying that:

"Principals have been notified to spend their money for essential supplies only. Analyzing your account we find you have spent considerable money for sewing, work shop, and drawing supplies. These, in the opinion of the committee, should be furnished only after the essentials have been purchased for the pupils, as they feel that the parents of the children would not find fault if the children did not have a piece of lumber, or a piece of gingham, but they would do so if the children did not have books, pens, ink, paper, etc."

June 26. — Public School 6, Manhattan. Principal requests that the 1A class room be rearranged to comply with the suggestions on children's welfare of the Women Principals' Association. Deputy Superintendent reported cost, according to plan (1), about \$800; according to plan (2), \$575. No funds are available.

July 20. — The Committee on Vocational Schools asks if there is money for running supplies for the New York Preparatory Trade School if it should take it over in September, 1911. The Committee on Supplies replies that "the amount of money available for supplies for the present year is totally inadequate for the needs and requirements of the elementary and high schools, and their activities, and the committee regrets that, because of this condition, it is unable to appropriate the money for the purpose requested."

Sept. 13. — Requisition, Public School 58, Queens, for work shop supplies. Denied, for no money is available. "It has been found necessary to request an issue of \$100,000

in Special Revenue Bonds for furnishing supplies for the remainder of the year. This request was placed on file by the Board of Aldermen at its meeting on July 25, 1911, for the reason that it can remain unacted upon until the investigation of this department now under way is completed."

Sept. 13. — Requisitions Nos. 3, 4, and 5 from the City Superintendent of Schools for stationery costing in the aggregate \$230.85. The City Superintendent is asked to reduce this amount. He is also advised that, as most of these supplies are for use by the Board of Examiners, that the secretary is instructed to call his attention to the fact that the municipal Civil Service compels all applicants for examinations for positions to furnish the necessary stationery, etc., required for said examinations and to ascertain if it is not possible for the Board of Examiners to issue similar instructions and thus eliminate a considerable portion of the cost now entailed by examination.

Sept. 13. — The Committee on Supplies asked for sufficient funds for all purposes for the year 1911. The Board of Estimate and Apportionment saw fit to cut out \$139,467.57, thereby leaving us short of funds for necessary supplies. The average amount of supplies furnished for all activities for the past four years represents \$1,189,877.94. The amount available for the present year represents a stock of \$138,917.56 and an appropriation of \$973,000, making a total of \$1,111,917.56. This is much less than the requirements for any year during the past four years. The committee regrets that it cannot accept any more requisitions for supplies for the high schools for the balance of this year chargeable to the Supply Fund.

Oct. 5. — Communication from Mr. Frank H. Mann, Secretary of the Committee on the Prevention of Tuberculosis of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, dated October 2, 1911, recommending that a scale be furnished for the open-air class in Public School 89, Manhattan. It was decided to advise Mr. Mann as follows:

“The Superintendent of School Supplies, in the first instance, would have furnished the scale were it not for the limited amount of money at the command of the committee. While the amount involved is small, the fact remains that the committee has been obliged to refuse the elementary schools the supplies that are considered by them as essentials. The committee is trying, so far as possible, to supply the schools with books, ink, paper, pens, and pencils. The Board of Education has asked for extra funds for the year 1911, which request has been approved by the Board of Aldermen. As soon as we are advised that this money is available the scale will be purchased and delivered.”

Oct. 9. — Associate Superintendent Stevens made the following report:

“There are probably 10,000 textbooks in use by high school pupils in this city that are so filthy that if the attention of the Department of Health were called to them I am confident they would require their destruction. I make this statement without any hesitancy at all. There are 10,000 boys and girls paying for their pens, pencils, and paper in the high schools to-day. I know of classes that have had absolutely no material for domestic science, sewing, cooking, or shop work for months.”

Dec. 22. — The chairman of the Supplies Committee called attention to the fact that on and after January 1, 1912, the services of a waitress at the New York Parental School will be discontinued for the reason that the Board of Estimate and Apportionment failed to provide for this position in the budget for 1912; stated that it would be necessary to employ some person to look after the rooms and offices of the principal of said school and recommended that a resolution be presented to the Board of Education to the

effect that Miss ——— be allowed board and lodging at said school in consideration of services to be rendered by her, as above stated, and that she receive no other compensation.

Jan. 5, 1912. — From City Superintendent:

“It is highly desirable that the public school buildings should be made places of amusement for all the people, and thus drive out, as far as may be, evil resorts. It is quite evident, on the other hand, that we are not going to receive money enough through public taxation for this purpose. . . . If we could collect two or three cents from each applicant for admission we should have a considerable revenue, certainly enough to defray expenses.”

The committee asked for \$139,467.57 in the budget for 1911 to provide supplies for increased attendance during the year 1911, and for the additional work shops, kitchens, etc., which it was proposed to establish during the year 1911. No increase over amount of appropriation for 1910 was allowed.

The Committee on Supplies has repeated its request for extra moneys in order to carry on its various activities for the balance of the year, but no money will be available for any increase, whether caused by change in course of study or other causes.

Requisitions Nos. 76, 77, and E66, from the Inspector of Classes for the Blind, for supplies for new classes of blind children. The committee instructed the secretary to inform the Inspector of Classes for the Blind that, owing to lack of funds, it will be impossible to furnish the supplies called for in her requisition at the present time.

Public School 52. Local board asks for additional blackboards in rooms 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, and 14. “No funds.” Window boards for thirty windows. “No funds.”

Public School 74. Thermostats to control the radiators in the class rooms. There are no funds for installing thermostat control.

Public School 75. Picture molding in class rooms. No funds are available.

Bushwick High School. Principal asks for furniture for his office at Public School 162. Denied because no funds are available.

Public School 8, Manhattan. Local school board calls attention to lack of suitable dressing rooms for teachers in the school. No funds are available to perform all the work requested. Some additional lockers have been supplied.

Requisition from Public School 143, Brooklyn, for pictures (\$12.50). Denied because of lack of funds.

Requisition, Public School 84, Brooklyn, for one picture (\$25.35). Denied because of lack of funds.

Requisition, Public School 158, Brooklyn, for pictures (\$8.00). Denied because of lack of funds.

The amount available for supplies this year (1912) is about \$70,000 less than the actual deliveries for the past four years, and \$50,000 less than the deliveries for 1910. The committee cannot, therefore, allow \$81.61 for elementary science supplies for Public School 23, Brooklyn.

Public School 6B. The principal asks for various articles of gymnasium equipment which will cost \$200 and for which no provision has been made.

Public School 72. The formation of a kindergarten room is requested, the cost of the necessary work being about \$670. No funds for the same being available.

All the above requests were ordered noted.

Public Schools 26, 35, 70. Local school board asks that pianos be furnished for the kindergartens. There are no funds.

Public School 166. Superintendents recommend equipment of a science room. Disapproved because there are no funds.

56 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

Public School 17, Brooklyn. Local school board asks for a new piano. Notified that Board of Estimate and Apportionment refused to grant the request of the Board of Education for funds for the purchase of pianos for the old school buildings.

Public School 36, Brooklyn. The same as preceding.

Manual Training High School Annex, Brooklyn. Furnish eight cases. Report: Those cases will cost about \$250; there are no funds available for the purpose. One 36-inch Oliver band saw and one bench grinder. Report: These articles will cost about \$450; no funds are available.

NOTE: The requests denied by the supplies committee alone, during three years, were as follows, though according to its plan of furnishing supplies it should have filled all requisitions made by principals and approved by the district superintendent had it been able to do so:

								Amount
1909	Up to October	1st	number	of	requests	80		\$23,856
1910	" "	"	"	"	"	95		\$25,320
1911	" "	"	"	"	"	198		\$69,984

These include textbooks in wretched condition in a number of schools and requests for kindergarten, shop, and cooking supplies, supplies imperatively needed for new classes, new books required because of contagious diseases, etc., etc. The list tells a tale of sorry educational conditions.

CHAPTER V

THE RELATION OF SCHOOL APPROPRIATION TO ASSESSED VALUATION OF SCHOOL GROWTH SINCE 1899

THE following tables, prepared by the Auditor of the Board of Education to accompany and illustrate the need of a revision of the method of financing the public schools, proposed by him in 1905, and brought up to date by him at my request, make clear the inadequacy of the present method of funding the schools.

The percentage of increase or decrease of one year over another is not shown in statement M, page 72, for the reason that, until July, 1910, Corporate Stock for new buildings and sites was not authorized in any given month of a year; for example, items shown as authorized in a given fiscal year were, in some instances, authorized early in the fiscal year, and, in other instances, not until late in the year, even as late as the last day. Therefore, a percentage comparison of one year with another would be meaningless. Beginning with July, 1910, an attempt has been made to have a Corporate Stock Budget for a year running from July to July. This has been done to the extent of tentatively setting aside or dividing up among departments, as at July 1, such amounts in round figures as the Board of Estimate and Apportionment decides upon. Such action does not, *per se*, make the funds available. It is still necessary for the Board of Education to obtain consent and approval to undertake any specific project, so that the net effect of the Corporate Stock Budget, so far as the Board of Education is concerned, is to restrict its hopes to a certain round sum, which, in the end, may or may not be rendered available, depending upon the final willingness of the financial authorities to carry out the plans of the Board of Education.

STATEMENT A

ASSESSED VALUATION OF THE REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK SINCE CONSOLIDATION,
WITH YEARLY PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE

Fiscal Year	"Mill" Tax	Assessed Valuation Real and Personal Property	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1898 }	"Mill" tax not in effect at this time .	\$3,074,836,200.00
1899 }		3,478,352,029.00	\$403,515,829.00	13.12
1900	(Basis for 4 "Mill" tax 1901)	3,654,122,193.00	175,770,164.00	5.05
1901	(Basis for 4 "Mill" tax 1902)	3,787,970,873.00	133,848,680.00	3.66
1902	(Basis for 4 "Mill" tax 1903)	3,857,047,718.00	69,076,845.00	1.82
1903 ¹	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1904)	5,432,398,918.00	1,575,351,200.00	40.84
1904	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1905)	5,640,542,657.00	208,143,739.00	3.83
1905	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1906)	5,912,146,227.00	271,603,570.00	4.81
1906	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1907)	6,305,794,185.00	393,647,958.00	6.65
1907	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1908)	6,795,341,915.00	489,547,730.00	7.76
1908	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1909)	7,158,190,400.00	362,848,485.00	5.33
1909	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1910)	7,250,500,559.00	92,310,159.00	1.28
1910	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1911)	7,416,837,499.00	166,336,940.00	2.29
1911	(Basis for 3 "Mill" tax 1912)	8,216,763,287.00	799,925,788.00	10.78

¹ Change in method of assessment. The "Mill" tax was .004 on the assessed valuation of the years 1900, 1901, and 1902; was reduced to .003 on the assessed valuation of 1903 and thereafter, owing to assessments at greater per cent of property valuations.

STATEMENT B

PRODUCT OF THE "MILL" TAX PROVIDED BY SECTION 1064 OF THE GREATER NEW YORK CHARTER, SHOWING ALSO
THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH YEAR OVER THE PRECEDING YEAR

Fiscal Year	"Mill" Tax	"Mill" Product	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1901	(4 Mills on assessed valuation year 1900) .	\$14,616,488.77
1902	(4 Mills on assessed valuation year 1901) .	15,151,883.49	\$535,394.72	3.66
1903	(4 Mills on assessed valuation year 1902) .	15,428,190.87	276,307.38	1.82
1904	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1903) .	16,297,196.75	869,005.88	5.63
1905	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1904) .	16,921,627.97	624,431.22	3.83
1906	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1905) .	17,736,438.68	814,810.71	4.81
1907	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1906) .	18,917,382.55	1,180,943.87	6.65
1908	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1907) .	20,386,025.75	1,468,643.20	7.76
1909	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1908) .	21,474,571.20	1,088,545.45	5.33
1910	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1909) .	21,751,501.68	276,930.48	1.28
1911	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1910) .	22,250,512.49	499,010.81	2.29
1912	(3 Mills on assessed valuation year 1911) .	24,650,289.86	2,399,777.37	10.78

STATEMENT C

THE GENERAL SCHOOL FUND BUDGET REQUESTS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, SHOWING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH YEAR OVER THE PRECEDING YEAR

Fiscal Year	Budget Request Board of Education	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1899	\$12,112,836.77
1900	13,747,656.56	\$1,634,819.79	13.49
1901	14,616,488.77	868,832.21	6.31
1902	15,664,534.89	1,048,046.12	7.17
1903	15,899,618.48	235,083.59	1.50
1904	17,239,974.55	1,340,356.07	8.43
1905	18,728,487.47	1,488,512.92	8.63
1906	19,403,966.47	675,479.00	3.60
1907	20,864,976.72	1,461,010.25	7.52
1908	21,962,003.68	1,097,026.96	5.25
1909	23,261,876.70	1,299,873.02	5.91
1910	24,624,914.88	1,363,038.18	5.85
1911	25,525,955.80	901,040.92	3.65
1912	29,954,949.23	4,428,993.43	17.35

STATEMENT D

THE GENERAL SCHOOL FUND APPROPRIATIONS BY THE BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND APPORTIONMENT AND THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN, SHOWING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH YEAR OVER THE PRECEDING YEAR

Fiscal Year	General School Fund Appropriations by Board of Estimate and Apportionment and Board of Aldermen	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1899	\$11,005,286.65
1900	13,152,400.87	\$2,147,114.22	19.51
1901	14,616,488.77	1,464,087.90	11.13
1902	15,151,883.49	535,394.72	3.66
1903	15,651,883.49	500,000.00	3.29
1904	16,657,227.21	1,005,343.72	6.42
1905	17,783,868.74	1,126,641.53	6.76
1906	18,739,422.97	955,554.23	5.37
1907	19,845,870.58	1,106,447.61	5.90
1908	21,038,075.22	1,192,204.64	6.00
1909	22,094,821.43	1,056,746.21	5.02
1910	23,130,014.40	1,035,192.97	4.68
1911	23,990,655.92	860,641.52	3.72
1912	28,421,601.04	4,430,945.12	18.47

STATEMENT E

THE BUDGET REQUEST OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION COMPARED WITH THE "MILL" PRODUCT, WITH PERCENTAGE OF DEFICIT OF THE LATER BELOW THE FORMER

Fiscal Year	General School Fund Budget Request Board of Education	"Mill" Product		"Mill" Product Less Than Budget Request	Per Cent of Deficit "Mill" Tax Below Budget Request
		Basis	Amount		
1901	\$14,616,488.77	4 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1900	\$14,616,488.77
1902	15,664,534.89	4 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1901	15,151,883.49	\$512,651.40	3.27
1903	15,899,618.48	4 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1902	15,428,190.87	471,427.61	2.96
1904	17,239,974.55	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1903	16,297,196.75	942,777.80	5.47
1905	18,728,487.47	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1904	16,921,627.97	1,806,859.50	9.64
1906	19,403,966.47	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1905	17,736,438.68	1,667,527.79	8.59
1907	20,864,976.72	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1906	18,917,382.55	1,947,594.17	9.33
1908	21,962,003.68	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1907	20,386,025.75	1,575,977.93	7.17
1909	23,261,876.70	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1908	21,474,571.20	1,787,305.50	7.68
1910	24,624,914.88	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1909	21,751,501.68	2,873,413.20	11.66
1911	25,525,955.80	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1910	22,250,512.49	3,275,443.31	12.83
1912	29,954,949.23	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1911	24,650,289.86	5,304,659.37	17.70

STATEMENT F

THE GENERAL SCHOOL FUND APPROPRIATIONS BY THE BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND APPOINTMENT AND THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN COMPARED WITH THE PRODUCT OF THE "MILL" TAX PROVIDED IN SECTION 1064 OF THE GREATER NEW YORK CHARTER

Fiscal Year	General School Fund Appropriation	"Mill" Product		Increase of Appropriation Over "Mill" Product	Per Cent of Increase of Appropriation Over "Mill" Product
		Basis	Amount		
1901	\$14,616,488.77	4 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1900	\$14,616,488.77
1902	15,151,883.49	4 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1901	15,151,883.49
1903	15,651,883.49	4 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1902	15,428,190.87	\$223,692.62	1.44
1904	16,657,227.21	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1903	16,297,196.75	360,030.46	2.20
1905	17,783,868.74	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1904	16,921,627.97	862,240.77	5.09
1906	18,739,422.97	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1905	17,736,438.68	1,002,984.29	5.65
1907	19,845,870.58	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1906	18,917,382.55	928,488.03	4.90
1908	21,038,075.22	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1907	20,386,025.75	652,049.47	3.19
1909	22,094,821.43	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1908	21,474,571.20	620,250.23	2.88
1910	23,130,014.40	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1909	21,751,501.68	1,378,512.72	6.33
1911	23,990,655.92	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1910	22,250,512.49	1,740,143.43	7.82
1912	28,421,601.04	3 Mills on assessed valuation, year 1911	24,650,289.86	3,771,311.18	15.29

STATEMENT G

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN DAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, INCLUDING KINDERGARTENS AND PRACTICE DEPARTMENTS OF TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS, SHOWING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH SCHOOL YEAR OVER THE PRECEDING SCHOOL YEAR

School Year	Average Daily Attendance	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1898-1899	350,225
1899-1900	367,402	17,177	4.90
1900-1901	385,489	18,087	4.92
1901-1902	406,007	20,518	5.32
1902-1903	424,232	18,225	4.48
1903-1904	448,950	24,718	5.82
1904-1905	468,109	19,159	4.26
1905-1906	485,812	17,703	3.78
1906-1907	501,741	15,929	3.27
1907-1908	520,960	19,219	3.83
1908-1909	545,218	24,258	4.65
1909-1910	554,178	8,960	1.64
1910-1911	568,391	14,213	2.56

STATEMENT H

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN DAY HIGH SCHOOLS, SHOWING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH SCHOOL YEAR OVER THE PRECEDING SCHOOL YEAR

School Year	Average Daily Attendance	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1898-1899	8,672
1899-1900	10,809	2,137	24.64
1900-1901	12,439	1,630	15.08
1901-1902	13,889	1,450	11.65
1902-1903	15,121	1,232	8.87
1903-1904	16,865	1,744	11.53
1904-1905	18,015	1,150	6.81
1905-1906	18,908	893	4.95
1906-1907	19,880	972	5.14
1907-1908	22,465	2,585	13.00
1908-1909	27,488	5,023	22.36
1909-1910	30,252	2,764	10.05
1910-1911	32,492	2,240	7.40

STATEMENT I

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS—
THEORY DEPARTMENT ONLY—SHOWING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF
INCREASE OF EACH SCHOOL YEAR OVER THE PRECEDING SCHOOL YEAR

School Year	Average Daily Attendance	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1898-1899	1
1899-1900	1
1900-1901	1
1901-1902	584
1902-1903	575	Less 9	Less 1.54
1903-1904	756	181	31.47
1904-1905	881	125	16.53
1905-1906	1,107	226	25.65
1906-1907	1,463	356	32.15
1907-1908	1,673	210	14.35
1908-1909	1,958	285	17.04
1909-1910	2,134	176	8.98
1910-1911	2,051	Less 83	Less .38

¹ Figures not available at this time.

STATEMENT J

AVERAGE NIGHTLY ATTENDANCE IN EVENING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, SHOW-
ING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH SCHOOL YEAR OVER
THE PRECEDING SCHOOL YEAR

School Year	Average Nightly Attendance	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1898-1899	13,719
1899-1900	14,407	688	5.01
1900-1901	17,538	3,131	21.73
1901-1902	17,763	225	1.28
1902-1903	19,986	2,223	12.51
1903-1904	23,491	3,505	17.53
1904-1905	28,390	4,899	20.85
1905-1906	28,821	431	1.51
1906-1907	32,955	4,134	14.34
1907-1908	33,273	318	.96
1908-1909	32,019	Less 1,254	Less 3.76
1909-1910	27,725	Less 4,294	Less 13.41
1910-1911	30,378	2,653	9.56

STATEMENT K

AVERAGE NIGHTLY ATTENDANCE IN EVENING HIGH AND TRADE SCHOOLS,
SHOWING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH SCHOOL YEAR
OVER THE PRECEDING SCHOOL YEAR

School Year	Average Nightly Attendance	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1898-1899	2,637
1899-1900	2,880	243	9.21
1900-1901	3,901	1,021	35.45
1901-1902	5,121	1,220	31.27
1902-1903	4,926	Less 195	Less 3.8
1903-1904	5,257	331	6.71
1904-1905	5,257
1905-1906	7,016	1,759	33.46
1906-1907	7,469	453	6.45
1907-1908	8,476	1,007	13.48
1908-1909	9,998	1,522	17.95
1909-1910	9,343	Less 655	Less 6.55
1910-1911	10,829	1,486	15.90

STATEMENT L

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN CORPORATE SCHOOLS, SHOWING ALSO THE PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH SCHOOL YEAR OVER THE PRECEDING SCHOOL YEAR

Year of Payment	Based Upon Attendance of School Year	Average Daily Attendance	Increase Over Preceding Year	Per Cent of Increase Over Preceding Year
1900	1898-1899	19,394
1901	1899-1900	16,417	Less 2,977	Less 15.35
1902	1900-1901	18,514	2,097	12.77
1903	1901-1902	19,145	631	3.41
1904	1902-1903	18,730	Less 415	Less 2.16
1905	1903-1904	18,733	3	.02
1906	1904-1905	18,846	113	.60
1907	1905-1906	18,463	Less 383	Less 2.03
1908	1906-1907	17,752	Less 711	Less 3.85
1909	1907-1908	18,113	361	2.03
1910	1908-1909	18,602	489	2.69
1911	1909-1910	17,462	Less 1,140	Less 6.12
1912	1910-1911	16,722	Less 740	Less 4.23

70 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

SUMMARY — FACTS RELATING TO

PERCENTAGE INCREASES OF EACH YEAR OVER THE NEXT PRECEDING PARTICULAR FACTOR SHOWN IN

Statement	Fiscal Year 1900	Fiscal Year 1901	Fiscal Year 1902	Fiscal Year 1903
A ASSESSED VALUATION — Per cent of increase of one year over next preceding year	13.12	5.05	3.66	1.82
B "MILL" PRODUCT — Per cent of increase of one year over next preceding year	3.66	1.82
C BUDGET REQUEST — GENERAL SCHOOL FUND — Per cent of increase of one year over next preceding year . . .	13.49	6.31	7.17	1.5
D APPROPRIATION — GENERAL SCHOOL FUND — Per cent of increase of one year over next preceding year . . .	19.51	11.13	3.66	3.29
E BUDGET REQUEST EXCEEDED "MILL" PRODUCT	3.27	2.96
F APPROPRIATION EXCEEDED "MILL" PRODUCT	1.44

AVERAGE ATTENDANCE — PER CENT OF INCREASE OF ONE

G DAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, including kindergartens and practice departments of training schools for teachers	4.90	4.92	5.32
H DAY HIGH SCHOOLS	24.64	15.08	11.65
I TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS — THEORY DEPARTMENT ONLY
J EVENING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	5.01	21.73	1.28
K EVENING HIGH SCHOOLS	9.21	35.45	31.27
L CORPORATE SCHOOLS	15.35 ¹	12.77	3.41

¹ Decrease.

School Appropriations and Assessed Valuations 71

GENERAL SCHOOL FUND

YEAR, LISTED IN EACH CASE UNDER THE FISCAL YEAR AFFECTED BY THE
THE FIRST COLUMN AT THE LEFT

Fiscal Year 1904	Fiscal Year 1905	Fiscal Year 1906	Fiscal Year 1907	Fiscal Year 1908	Fiscal Year 1909	Fiscal Year 1910	Fiscal Year 1911	Fiscal Year 1912
40.84	3.83	4.81	6.65	7.76	5.33	1.28	2.29	10.78
5.63	3.83	4.81	6.65	7.76	5.33	1.28	2.29	10.78
8.43	8.63	3.60	7.52	5.25	5.91	5.85	3.65	17.35
6.42	6.76	5.37	5.90	6.00	5.02	4.68	3.72	18.47
5.47	9.64	8.59	9.33	7.17	7.68	11.66	12.83	17.70
2.20	5.09	5.65	4.90	3.19	2.88	6.33	7.82	15.29

SCHOOL YEAR OVER THE NEXT PRECEDING SCHOOL YEAR

4.48	5.82	4.26	3.78	3.27	3.83	4.65	1.64	2.56
8.87	11.53	6.81	4.95	5.14	13.00	22.36	10.05	7.40
1.54 ¹	31.47	16.53	25.65	32.15	14.35	17.04	8.98	.38 ¹
12.51	17.53	20.85	1.51	14.34	.96	3.76 ¹	13.41 ¹	9.56
3.8 ¹	6.71	33.46	6.45	13.48	17.95	6.55 ¹	15.90
2.16 ¹	.02	.60	2.03 ¹	3.85 ¹	2.03	2.69	6.12 ¹	4.23 ¹

¹ Decrease.

STATEMENT M

AMOUNT OF THE SCHOOL BUILDING FUND FOR NEW SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND
SITES AUTHORIZED *in each year*

Fiscal Year	Amount of Corporate Stock Authorized
1898	None (year of consolidation)
1899	\$7,683,640.00
1900	3,500,000.00
1901	3,700,000.00
1902	8,000,000.00
1903	9,788,430.00
1904	9,350,000.00
1905	15,000,000.00
1906	13,000,000.00
1907	3,500,000.00
1908	8,771,779.00
1909	1,600,966.04
1910	5,270,173.26
1911	12,138,387.39

In the year 1904 the Board of Estimate and Apportionment reduced the General School Fund a quarter million dollars, then authorized a transfer from the General Repair appropriation to the General School Fund, and finally granted Special Revenue Bonds to eke out the General Repair item.

In the years 1905, 1906, and 1908 the General Repair item was again arbitrarily reduced, and then additional funds given by means of Special Revenue Bonds. In 1906 the reduction amounted to a half million dollars, and the Board of Education was obliged to appeal to the legislature for relief, for the reason that the financial authorities were unable to recoup the cuts from appropriations out of the full amount of Special Revenue Bonds which the law permitted them to issue during the year. The Board of Education was obliged to shift for itself, and, in the end, the legislature passed a special act to relieve the situation.

In the years 1910 and 1911 the fund for Compensation

STATEMENT N

AMOUNT AVAILABLE IN THE SPECIAL SCHOOL FUND AND THE PERCENTAGE BY WHICH SUCH AMOUNT FALLS BELOW
THE BUDGET REQUEST

Fiscal Year	Budget Request Board of Education	Amount Allowed by Estimate and Apportionment	Revenue Bond Allowed by Estimate and Apportionment	Total Amount Available During Year	Amount Available Less Than Budget Request	Per Cent of Amount Available Less Than Budget Request
1899	\$2,948,860.75	\$2,788,869.94	\$2,788,869.94	\$159,990.81	5.42
1900	3,294,116.88	2,565,986.08	2,565,986.08	728,130.80	22.10
1901	4,676,380.03	3,896,328.92	3,896,328.92	780,051.11	16.68
1902	4,096,895.15	4,071,134.28	\$25,000.00	4,096,134.28	760.87	0.01
1903	5,462,879.10	4,411,134.28	85,000.00	4,496,134.28	966,744.82	17.69
1904	5,995,497.75	4,255,700.56	316,343.72	4,572,134.28	1,423,363.47	23.73
1905	5,503,363.35	4,213,149.03	80,000.00	4,293,149.03	1,210,214.32	21.99
1906	5,722,974.49	4,618,765.72	515,000.00	5,133,765.72	588,308.77	10.28
1907	5,930,421.41	5,070,057.58	5,070,057.58	860,363.83	14.50
1908	6,550,752.38	5,674,888.37	60,000.00	5,734,888.37	815,864.01	12.45
1909	6,496,444.43	5,425,915.37	14,881.00	5,440,796.37	1,055,648.06	16.24
1910	6,622,467.09	5,446,484.70	97,291.67	5,543,776.37	1,078,690.72	16.28
1911	6,799,798.98	5,017,091.22	164,877.92	5,181,969.14	1,617,829.84	23.79
1912	6,902,535.23	5,428,218.70	5,428,218.70	1,474,316.53	21.35

of Janitors was cut by the financial authorities below the fixed rate of expenditure, and Revenue Bonds subsequently granted to make good the deficit.

In the year 1911 the fund for General Supplies was subjected to the same treatment.

A study of these tables shows that there is no constant relation in New York City between the annual increase in the assessed valuation of property and the increase in average attendance in the schools. If this is true the schools cannot be adequately funded by means of a constant proportion of an unchanging tax rate, unless that proportion be made large enough to provide a margin to take care of unexpected needs. The tables also show that there is no constant relation between the increase in appropriations from year to year and the increase in average attendance in the schools. And they show an annual difference between the amount of money available in the Special School Fund and the amount requested by the Board of Education for the present year, and the last one of about a million and a half dollars per annum, or that more than twenty per cent of the amount estimated as needed for its work by the Board of Education was refused it by the fiscal authorities of the city. It is not to be expected that the schools can be kept in as good condition on $\frac{4}{5}$ of the money which is estimated as necessary, as on $\frac{5}{5}$ of it. The discrepancy between the amount asked for and the amount allowed seems to be altogether too great for either good fiscal administration, or the proper operation of the schools. Some method can, and should be, adopted by which the public service can be rendered more secure than it now is. Both the more careful preparation of the estimates, and the more careful consideration of them when they are presented, seem to be required.

CHAPTER VI

NEED FOR SIMPLIFIED METHODS OF ACCOUNTING TO THE CITY

THERE is one other respect in which the conditions which affect the work of the Board of Education can be improved. That is by a needed simplification of requirements as to the forms in which accounts are to be submitted to the auditing department of the city. The Board of Education, acting under the authority conferred upon it by Section 1068 of the charter, makes its own by-laws for the conduct of its business. But from time to time requirements are made, and not always with sufficient consideration for the work which must be done, which necessitate radical departures from the requirements which it has found necessary for the proper conduct of its business.

A communication from the Comptroller of the city on or about February 6, 1911, is to the effect that, where so much work is going on under the supervision of many different heads, it is entirely in the interest of the city to adopt rules which will assist the respective heads in determining that actual value is being given to the city for the money expended; that all that the Department of Finance requires is a statement on the bill itself showing the quantities of the different materials furnished and the number of hours consumed in the work by the different classes of employees; that itemized bills are a great assistance in protecting the city against excessive claims. All this seems quite reasonable, but the Committee on Buildings explains that it will very gravely affect its methods of doing

business; that it is now carrying out the work referred to by the Comptroller in accordance with subdivisions 2, 3, and 5 of Section 31 of the by-laws of the Board of Education, which require the obtaining of competitive bids; that, when such competitive bids are received, the committee does not feel justified in asking the contractors to render itemized bills; that, if the Comptroller insists on this requirement, the only way which would seem feasible is to issue orders without competition to the contractors and to request the submission of itemized bills for the work; that, if this is done, it will involve additional cost of from twenty-five per cent to thirty per cent, and to do it the by-laws of the board should be amended.

The Board of Education is requested to prepare for each monthly payroll of teachers submitted a schedule of deductions, showing the name, amount, school, period of time, and nature of deduction. In one month there were 5,178 such deductions for absence, which, if normal for the eleven payrolls of the year, would make the number about 55,000. This would mean that 55,000 items already entered upon the original payrolls must be listed separately, thus delaying the preparation of the payrolls beyond the time fixed for them, and placing a heavy burden of seemingly needless copying of records, already sufficient for all purposes, upon the clerks in the offices of the Board of Education.

A colossal amount of supplementary record making is constantly being required by the Department of Finance. In the case of a small department of the city's government, this would not be difficult to furnish; but, in the case of a vast undertaking like that of the Board of Education, it is next to impossible to supply it. The Department of Finance requires advance notices of all repair work about to be done under orders, contracts, or agreements, so that it may send inspectors to inspect such work while it is in progress. But a special staff of clerks would be required to keep track of notifications of all the work that is being done, and the time at which each job is to be begun; and

a force of inspectors as large as that which the Bureau of Buildings maintains would have to be detailed to accompany the Bureau of Buildings' inspectors all the time.

Copies of all orders issued by the Bureau of School Supplies also are asked for in order that inspectors from the Department of Finance may inspect such supplies upon their delivery. As supplies are received by the principals of the different schools, as well as at the several depositories of the Board of Education, a large staff of inspectors would be needed for that purpose, and without such a staff the heavy labor of furnishing copies of all orders would be in vain. Such a system of duplicate inspection would inevitably complicate and delay the delivery of supplies, — and such delivery is a business of no little difficulty even when all hindering conditions are removed.

Again, the Board of Education is asked to synchronize its accounts with those of the Department of Finance twelve times each year. All claims allowed in a given month by the one department must reach the other in time to be allowed and entered as a transaction of that month also. No charge must be made by one until it is made by the other also. Much time and energy are to be spent in overcoming the features of duality, distance, differences in office routine, and difference in the doing of business. The books are in effect to be closed twelve times a year.

THE SCHOOLS MUST BE FREE

These and many similar hindrances to efficiency are forced upon the Board of Education by the effort to establish a uniform method by which the business of all departments shall be reduced to the same system. Every change in officers at the City Hall involves a new system and method of doing the school business. The difficulty is a fundamental one; namely, that each department exists to perform its own work under the conditions peculiar to that work, which make its task different from those of other departments. It is

commonly recognized that education cannot be reduced to the same system of administrative control as can be followed in dealing with the health, police, and fire departments of a city, because the school is an institution coördinate in dignity and importance with government, the church, and the family, and must not be subordinated to any one of them. For its work it requires freedom; and through its necessities it has obtained freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and is now in process of attaining a third form of freedom equally necessary to its undertaking, namely, the freedom of teaching. This means that it itself shall control its own courses of study, its own methods and conditions of instruction, sufficient money for its business, and its own expenditures of funds set apart for purposes of education. Other cities have recognized this necessity for freedom of instruction ahead of New York City, as the following statements of methods of school administration supplied by their school authorities — the Superintendent of Schools in the case of Boston, Philadelphia, Indianapolis, Kansas City, and St. Louis, and the Secretary of the School Board of Chicago — will indicate:

Boston

“Under the Boston charter the School Committee is an entirely independent board, and is not subject to control, direct or indirect, by any other city authority, except that its appropriations are submitted to the mayor for approval, and, in case of a veto, must be passed by a two-thirds’ vote of the board. This condition applies both to the general appropriation which comes from the tax levy and to the specific expenses during the year. The amount of money to be raised by tax is fixed by the legislature, which specifies the maximum amount that can be raised on each \$1,000 of the tax levy. The School Committee invariably appropriates the whole of this amount in one lump sum, and it is invariably approved by the mayor. Consequently, the veto authority

of the mayor is unimportant, because by vetoing a particular appropriation he does not thereby reduce the expense, but merely indicates a preference that it be expended in some other direction. It is very rare, therefore, that specific items are vetoed, and, whenever they are, they are usually promptly passed over the veto, on the ground that the School Committee is the better judge of the relative merits of conflicting claims for the money at its disposal. The mayor occasionally vetoes the item in the general appropriation for new school buildings, and the School Committee promptly passes the amount over his veto. Whenever the school committee finds that it cannot conduct the schools properly with the money at its disposal, it applies to the legislature for authority to increase the levy. During the past six years these applications have been frequent and the legislature has usually granted the request."

Philadelphia

"The new school code for Pennsylvania went into effect January 1, 1912. In accordance with this code, the School Board of Philadelphia was made an independent taxing body. The board can also make loans to the extent of 2 per cent of the total valuation of the taxable property. All bonds issued become due at stated periods, not exceeding 30 years. The taxes are collected the same as heretofore by the regular city authorities. The assessment is made annually, and an estimated statement of this assessment is certified to the board before the first day of November of each year.

"The Receiver of Taxes reports to the School Board at the end of each month the total amount of school taxes collected during the month. He must also make an annual statement by the first Monday of February of each year, giving a statement of the total amount of school taxes standing unpaid. The School Board makes an approximate estimate of the amount of funds re-

quired for the several departments for the following fiscal year. Such estimate is apportioned to the several classes of expenditures as the board may determine. Each school order must state on its face the particular item of the school estimate upon which it is drawn."

Indianapolis

"1. The Board of School Commissioners is a separate and distinct corporation.

"2. It has power to make its levy under the statute of Indiana, which is in the aggregate 67 cents on the \$100.00 of taxables in the city of Indianapolis; but the board is not taking advantage of its full power to levy 67 cents, and has, for the year 1911, made the levy 60 cents, divided into the several funds, amounts, and purposes:

Special Fund	44 cents
Manual Training Fund	5
Library Fund	4
Buildings and Grounds Funds	5
Free Kindergarten Fund	1
Teachers' Pension Fund	1
Total	<u>60 cents on the</u>
\$100.00 of taxables in the city of Indianapolis	

"Besides the levy power, the statute gives the board a bond-issuing power each calendar year of \$75,000.00 for new buildings and grounds only.

"In addition to the foregoing, under the State Educational Law the board receives its proportion of a state tuition fund distributed according to the annual enumeration of school children in the city from 6 to 21 years of age, which yielded for 1911-12 \$316,152.18, to be used only in paying teachers."

Chicago

"1st. The revenue of the Board of Education of Chicago available for new buildings, sites, and additions to old buildings, and permanent improvements, is derived from direct taxation, and is not subject to reduction. The board may ask the City Council to levy up to \$1.50 per \$100.00 on the equalized assessed valuation.

"2d. The revenue for educational or maintenance purposes is mainly derived from taxation. The Board of Education is authorized to ask the City Council to levy a rate for such purposes of not more than \$1.50 per \$100.00 on the equalized assessed valuation, but this is subject to a reduction under what is known as the Juul law down to a minimum rate of \$1.00 per \$100.00. In addition to the maintenance revenue from taxes the Board of Education has an income from interest on permanent funds derived from the sale of lands located in the original Section 16, and the rents of the remaining land in such section, and a pro rata share of the appropriation by the state legislature of \$2,000,000 for common school purposes, which is distributed throughout the counties of the state on a per capita basis, based upon the number of minors in each county, as shown by the last federal census. The experience of the board is that the City Council has always levied the amounts requested.

"3d. The City Council provides for the tax levy for school purposes, and when the money is collected by the county treasurer it is turned over to the city treasurer to the credit of the Board of Education, and is not subject to the control of the City Council, except as to appropriations made for new buildings or new sites. On these two matters the council has the veto power. The subdivision into appropriation is made by the Board of Education and is done at the beginning of each calendar year."

Kansas City

"It is necessary, for a clear understanding of the condition, to state that the municipal government of a city, town, or village in this state has nothing to do whatsoever with the school government. Both are independent corporations, each carrying on its functions in its own way under the laws of the state, and practically over the same population, though the corporate limits of the organizations may not extend over the same area.

"The Board of Education levies taxes for three purposes — the general expenses of carrying on the work of the schools; the purchase of school sites and the erection of buildings; and a sinking fund for paying accrued interest and bonded debts. The revenue is chiefly derived from *local taxation*, state appropriations, and from interest on county and township school funds. The school tax levied by the Board of Education is collected by the county collector, and is paid to the school treasurer, upon whom school warrants are drawn.

"The school boards of this state are limited only by the Constitution of the State and the statutory enactments of the legislature made in pursuance thereof. However, above a certain per cent, authorized by the constitution for school purposes, the voters of a district may vote to increase the school levy, not to exceed a specified constitutional limit."

St. Louis

"Sections 2 and 3 of the Charter of the Board of Education enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri read as follows:

"'Every city in this state now having, or which may hereafter have, five hundred thousand inhabitants or over, together with the territory now within its limits, or which may in the future be included by any change thereof, shall be and constitute a single school district,

shall be a body corporate, and the supervision and government of public schools and public school property therein shall be vested in a board of twelve members, to be called and known as the "Board of Education of _____" (in which title the name of such city shall be inserted), and in a Superintendent of Instruction, and a Commissioner of School Buildings. Such Board of Education shall, by and in said name, sue and be sued, purchase, receive, hold and sell property, do all things necessary to accomplish the purpose for the attainment of which such school district is organized, and succeed to all the property, rights, and privileges, of whatever kind or nature, granted, and belonging to any previous corporation, Board of Directors, or school district in such city, or officers thereof, authorized or empowered by any enactment of the General Assembly of the state to do anything in reference to public education.' (Section 2.)

"Every such Board of Education shall have general and supervising control, government, and management of the public schools and public school property in such city; shall exercise generally all powers in the administration of the public school system therein, appoint such officers, agents, and employees as it may deem necessary and proper, and fix their compensation; shall have power to fix the time of its meetings, to make, amend and repeal rules and by-laws for its meetings and proceedings, for the government, regulation and management of the public schools and school property in such city, and for the transaction of its business, and the examination, qualification, and employment of teachers, which rules and by-laws shall be binding on such Board of Education, and all parties dealing with it, until formally repealed; to provide for special and standing committees, to loan its funds, and to levy such taxes as are, or may be, authorized by law for school purposes, and to purchase and hold all property, real and personal,

84 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

deemed by it necessary for the purposes of public education, or for the investment of the public school funds, to build and construct improvements for such purposes, and to sell the same. 'Such Board of Education shall have all the powers of other school districts under the laws of this state, except as herein provided.' (Section 3.)"

Many other cities that have a reputation for the high character of their schools have adopted similar methods for controlling and financing public education. Among them are Cleveland, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Seattle, Denver, Portland, Oregon, Columbus, and Toledo.

CHAPTER VII

THE KIND OF BOARD OF EDUCATION NEEDED

THERE is the most pressing need for an authoritative definition of the school law and for a consolidation of school administration, and an elimination of all impeding relations of other boards and departments to the school system. There is most pressing need, also, for a new kind of Board of Education. A school board of forty-six members is an anachronism in school administration. The experience of American cities has been that school guidance by a crowd is a poor form of guidance. For this reason Philadelphia has changed the number in its school board from forty-two to fifteen; St. Louis from twenty-one to twelve; Boston from twenty-four to five, and Atlanta from fourteen to seven. The hall of the Board of Education in New York City is like the meeting place of a parliamentary body, but the failure in functioning of the large board does not lie in the fact that it spends its time in speech-making. The journal shows that only some twenty-nine different matters were discussed by the board at its meetings within one year. It also shows that only a few members take part in such discussions, and that the orators of the board rarely lose an opportunity to be heard in them. The subjects which provoked discussion were such as proposed salary schedules; reports of findings against members of the staff in cases where charges had been brought; the merging of eligible lists; the request of a neighborhood association to be permitted to use a high school assembly room for addresses and musical entertainments on Sunday evenings, and to

charge an admission fee; the size of kindergarten classes, and the advisability of employing kindergarten teachers all day; the appointment of a married woman to a position; the references to the Irish Brigade in the textbook on United States history; the educational provisions of the proposed charter; the estimates for the coming year; the recommendations of the Board of Retirement, etc. These were most of the debated points in the business of the year.

DEFECTS IN THE PRESENT BOARD

What the large board does lack, and must, from its size, lack, is unity, comprehension of its work, and energy in the performance of it. The large board inevitably splits up into factions. Places cannot be found for all on its more important committees. Some of its members must of necessity be more active than others. A few must guide while the others look on. It is too big for the consideration of policies. Its members do not know each other well enough to discuss their common function together. Without this intimacy of confidence the consideration of general plans for the welfare of the department is seldom or never reached. Each new member is overwhelmed by the routine which he finds in operation when he arrives, and, not being able to get a comprehension of the work of the department as a whole and in detail, he, little by little, acquiesces in the established routine as the proper method of conducting the school system. To do the thing that has been done, for the most part in the way it has been done, becomes the accepted notion of the board's business. The result is a non-progressive school administration.

There are some things which the Board of Education has done, which, for the educational welfare of the city, it ought not to have done. There are more things which it has left undone which it ought, in protecting the interests intrusted to it, to have done. As a board it has not come to close quarters with its work. It has trusted its commit-

tees to handle its business. It has no defined educational policy, and has not led in educational matters. It has not upheld the Education Law, but has allowed other departments of the city government to interpret the law for it, and to encroach upon its evident rights and functions almost to the point of eliminating it from the actual management and control of the public school system of the city. It has not charged itself with the duty of perfecting the law in order that it might itself fix the salaries of its own clerks and janitors as the necessities of its business require. It has not fought for adequate appropriations for school purposes. It has not coöperated in the proper measure with the local school boards, nor availed itself of their strength. It has not built up a strong unofficial public school auxiliary among the citizens. It has not played a strong part in educational legislation affecting its own work, such as the equal pay bill, and the proposed new charter of last year. It has not devised one system for the administration of its business, but several more or less unrelated and independent systems. It has not sufficiently considered the recommendations and suggestions which its own experts have made for the improvement of its work.

On the other hand, it has helped to pass "the anti-merging bill," which makes mandatory upon it and its successors the appointing of all candidates whose names are on the eligible list for three years, no matter how many better qualified teachers are available at the time.

WHAT IS NEEDED FOR GOOD SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

"The persons from whose agency the attainment of any end is expected, ought to possess the means by which it is attained." The end sought is the best possible education of the children. The Board of Education ought to possess the means for conducting and managing the schools. These means are a clear and definite law defining its functions, the consolidation of all the activities of the school system under

its jurisdiction, a dependable and sufficient income for school maintenance, freedom from official interference on the part of other municipal bodies, a school board of a character to make energetic administration possible, and such a systematization of functions as will accomplish the one object of the undertaking — the education of the young.

CHARACTER AND SIZE OF THE BOARD

Such a board must conduct its business as a board. The present board transacts its business by committees. Its decisions are not based upon the informed and deliberate judgment of the whole body, but upon the recommendations of its committees, based upon considerations not known to the board. It, and it alone, should represent the whole population in respect to its educational interests, and not territorial localities or denominations, political, religious, financial, or otherwise. Such a board must not be too big for unity of plan and unity of action. Whether it has five, seven, nine, eleven, or fifteen members is immaterial, if this one condition is met. The theory that a big city must have a big board is a patent absurdity. The big city must have a small board, because its school business is big and demands informed, united, and energetic action on the part of those who conduct it.

HOW CREATED

How should such a board be created, by appointment of the mayor, or by the election at large? In such a way as to secure the educational leadership of the best possible persons, and to free them entirely from partisan or personal obligations of every sort, manner, and form. Impersonal mayors are rare, and the best boards of education seem to be selected by direct vote of the people themselves. No method has yet been devised that will free the people from the necessity for constant watchfulness

for the welfare of their schools. Should the members of such a board be paid? Most emphatically no. The experience of the United States is against such an arrangement for the conduct of the schools. The paid board puts the management of public education into the hands of laymen; it belongs to experts. The services of the best citizens cannot be purchased for this purpose, and the lay service that is purchasable is not wanted if the interests of education are to determine the character of the board. The small unpaid board which we recommend must be well provided with paid expert service to put its policies into effect.

THE FUNCTIONS OF A BOARD OF EDUCATION

Its functions are not executive, but legislative, deliberative, advisory, and report-hearing. In the nature of the case, being a lay body, it cannot itself run the schools. Instead, it is there to represent the people by performing for them certain delegated functions of selecting experts to run the schools, advising with them as to how the people would have public education conducted, examining into the sufficiency of their plans, passing upon their reports of results, and maintaining a general oversight over all that they do; upholding and protecting them in their work as long as it is satisfactory, and putting others in their places as soon as it ceases to be so.

ITS MOST IMPORTANT DUTY

Perhaps the most important of all the duties of a board of education is to give such thoughtful consideration to its functions as shall enable it clearly to distinguish them from those of the experts whom it employs and charges with the conduct of the several divisions of the educational undertaking. Until boards of education are able to mark off the functions which they reserve for themselves in the

general scheme of school management from the functions which they expect their responsible agents to perform, and, at the same time, define the duties of each of these agents with respect to the others and with respect to the board itself, such a systematizing of responsibility as should organize the schools cannot possibly obtain. The board may, of course, find it necessary from time to time to intrust the special oversight of certain parts of its undertaking to committees of its members; but only for the purposes of preparing the business of these divisions for submission to the board itself, and not for the conduct of this business by the committee. Such committees it will reduce to the lowest possible number, in so far as it can, retaining for itself the necessity of becoming acquainted with its work as a whole and of employing the informed and deliberate judgment of the whole body to conduct its business. All routine matters not involving change of policy, or calling for special deliberation or decision on the part of the board, it will, by appropriate by-laws, intrust to its departmental staff, thus leaving itself free to attend to the major duties of its undertaking. It will also devise a system of reports which its departmental officers shall submit to it concerning the performance of their work. An enlarged staff it must have, and thoroughly adequate provision it must make for the gathering of information, and the printing and distribution of reports. Thus the Board of Education, like the board of directors of a business corporation, will look after the interests of the stockholders of the business, who, in this case, are the people; and will guarantee to them the proper dividends upon their investment, which, in this case, are the greatest possible educational benefits which they can, with the means at their disposal, provide for the children of the city; and, just as the actual management of the corporation is, and must be, intrusted to a staff of expert assistants whose work is guided and directed by its executive officer who reports to the directors and transmits their directions to his assistants, so must the work of a

board of education be conducted if the principles of scientific management are to be followed, and the highest efficiency of the school system is to be secured.

A GENERAL MANAGER NEEDED

What the Board of Education most lacks, and most needs, in its internal organization at the present time is a general manager, one head for its work who can captain the ship, protect and advance the undertaking, supply the energy that is needed, urge and direct the making of necessary plans for the whole department, fit its parts properly together, and keep them fitted together, so that they will function as one whole; consult with and dispose of most of the administrative problems which the heads of divisions must now refer to the various committees of the board, eliminate friction, and constantly devise ways and means for the betterment of the service in each of its particulars.

At present the Board of Education is the head of the school department. This head is composed of forty-six persons, and it has four executive officers with coördinate powers each responsible for his compartment of the ship. They are the City Superintendent of Schools, the Superintendent of Buildings, the Superintendent of School Supplies, and the Auditor of the Board of Education. But there is no one pilot of the ship; no directive head of the whole undertaking, save as the forty-six direct it. To this defect of organization, more than to any other, we think, is due the present unsatisfactory condition of school administration in New York. It is a custom which cities observe, to blame the superintendent of schools for what is amiss in the school department, and criticisms of the one man power are heard in this city; but it is not the one man power, but the no man power, which is directing the schools, and this system of irresponsibility is preventing the proper conduct of the educational activities of the city.

THE KIND OF GENERAL MANAGER NEEDED

The Board of Education must employ a general manager. This whole department and all that it includes are for purposes of education. When a man is wanted to manage a bank, a banker is selected. When a man is wanted to operate a railroad, a railroad man is chosen. And when a man is appointed to conduct an educational business, an educator must be chosen. If the people of New York want an educational system, they will put an educator at the head of it and make him general manager, and not put him in a subordinate position. If they do not want an educational system as much as they want a system of records, or of disbursing funds, or of political service, they will put men of these interests at the head of their school system and give the superintendent of instruction a secondary place. The one who is the expert in the work which is sought to be done must direct it. The others on the staff are contributing factors. School administration is sometimes divided between a business manager and an educational manager. This gives the business of the board two heads; but it is only one business, and two heads cannot well manage the affairs of one. The superintendent of schools must, then, be the general manager of the system.

As such he should be given sufficient power and authority by the laws and by the board of education to conduct the schools. He now sits with the board and has the right to speak at its meetings. But the time has come for a new development in functions. Just as railroads have found it advisable to make their general managers directors of the road, and universities to make their presidents regents, so must cities make their superintendents members of the board of education during the term for which they hold office, and require that their votes be made a matter of record so that there can be no question in fixing responsibility for what is done and what is not done in the administration of the educational department. Thus will the

ancient jealousy between the board of education and its own director be eradicated from school systems.

The legislation necessary to make this change should, of course, provide for the same right of dismissal of the superintendent by the board of education that university regents exercise in regard to presidents, who, by virtue of their office, are regents of the university. Yet, in this matter, there is a strange contradiction in school regulations. The head of the department of instruction holds office for a term of years, and must be reëlected or dismissed at the end of that time; the clerks in his office hold office permanently under civil service regulations; and the teachers in the instructing staff hold office for life, or during good behavior. It is questionable whether an ironclad permanence of tenure is best for any of them; but, at any rate, it is difficult to see why the head of the system should be the least secure of all the members of the staff in the permanence of his position, when, by all rules of reasoning, the director of an undertaking should be more firmly established than any one else, in order to direct with authority.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND ITS COMMITTEES

IN criticising the work of the Board of Education as a whole I must not be understood as finding fault with the work performed by its committees, its individual members, or its executive staff. Such a rating of their activities would be most unjust. While the Board of Education is a large, loose, and ineffective body, which does not assemble on time for its meetings, and only partly comes to order when it does assemble, its members give their time freely to committee work, and discharge their duties in this respect in a devoted and painstaking manner. So efficient are these small, compact groups when they meet to dispose of the business which is brought to them, that I am confident that any one of its major committees would make a more effective board of education than the board itself. The internal weakness of the present system is that the committees do the work and that there is nothing of real moment left for the board to do, but to meet and formally ratify what the committees have done. If what they have done is ratified without any question as to the wisdom of the recommendation being raised, it is hard to see just why this formal and unthinking duplication of action which has already been arrived at by inquiry, deliberation, and examination is necessary at all. On the other hand, if what the committee presents is not formally approved by the board, it must be remembered that the board has no other regular agency for investigating the work of a given field than just this committee whose conclusion, based upon in-

vestigation and study of the facts, it, without a systematic study and investigation of the matter, declines to support.

DEFECTS OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

It seems to me that no other conclusion is possible than this: Either the board ought to formulate its action as a result of its own informed and deliberate judgment, in which case the committees should by no means have the responsibility which they now have; or the committees should, by their informed and deliberate judgment, determine what is to be done, in which case the board is not necessary, and whatever unity obtains in the system will be due to their accidental agreement or to elaborate and long-drawn-out communications by the interchange of letters between the several equally authoritative committees. As a matter of fact this last is the system which is in effect now.

But the trouble is that just as the law as it is interpreted now does not systematize the functions and duties of the Board of Education and the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, but leads to a confusion of interference and indefinite responsibility, just so the committee system of the board leads to a confusion of authority and action in determining policies and action for the control of the schools. The committees do not form an interlocking system, but a series of more or less independent sovereignties; each has a business of its own, and is, naturally, exceedingly jealous of its own prerogatives. They communicate with each other diplomatically, like pride-protecting, independent states. Each committee conducts the work of its own executive bureau, to which it functions as a board of directors, and whose business must wait upon the meeting of the committee for its disposal, since there is no resident director present at the offices all the time, to whom the division heads may appeal for decision, guidance, advice, and direction. Much delay in conducting the business of the board is caused by this retention of executive duties by the board members, and the calendars of the committees are crowded

with a mass of routine details which do not in their nature call for board action for their disposal. A resident director, or general manager, duly authorized by law, could take care of much of this detail, and his presence would make greatly for the strengthening and unifying of the work of the different bureaus, and for the direct and speedy transaction of the business of the school department. Whatever can properly be settled and handled by the staff itself should not be allowed to consume the time and energy of the board members.

The principles of good business management demand that executive functions shall be delegated to experts employed by the board, and not performed by the board itself or its committees.¹ If most that is to be done must be referred to a committee of the board before it can be done, business lags, and a strong and responsible executive staff cannot be built up. The board itself is charged with the general direction of the business, with shaping the policies that are to be carried out by its staff, with systematizing their work, with passing upon reports of their acts, and with legislating for the business as a whole. When it charges itself with responsibility for conducting the details of the system it has no time or energy left for these more important matters, and, besides, it ties the hands of its administrative staff so that it cannot discharge its functions.

WHAT THE COMMITTEES SHOULD DO

What should the committees of a board of education do? In order that the board may function as a whole, the number of such committees must be as few as possible, and their authority must be limited to the initiation of action by means of recommendations and suggestions, and not be allowed to extend to the final disposal of business,

¹ Commissioner Andrew S. Draper has stated the principle which applies admirably: "Boards legislate and individuals execute. Boards should not be permitted to manage executive business, and individuals should not be left to themselves in the determination of policies."

except where specific matters are, from time to time, referred to them for decision by the board as a whole. In no other way can the board retain for itself the function of administering the schools for which it, and not its committees, was created by the people.

A SMALL BOARD NECESSARY

It may be objected, as it has been against the proposal that New York City must have a small school board, that a big city must have a school board with a great number of committees because the quantity of work to be attended to is so great. But many committees are no more necessary in the one case than a large board in the other. What is much more necessary than either of these is a systematizing of functions by which the Board of Education will clearly separate its task and responsibility of legislating internally and externally for the schools from that of its administrative staff, which is employed to execute the plans which the board approves. The principles and agencies for good school administration are the same in the large city as in the small one. The task is the same. What the big city demands is a particularly compact and efficient school directorate employing an exceptionally efficient, well-organized, and large staff to execute its policies and attend to its routine. A board of education small enough to give a unified, thoughtful, and energetic administration of the schools is one of the first available means of protecting them. Such a board will function as a whole, and not give over its authority to groups of its members. The great number of such committees at present is due, not to the inherent necessities of the work, but to the great number of board members for whom committee appointment must be found. The size of the board determines its organization and the way it must handle its business. When they are once created work must be found for the committees, and functions which should be intrusted to an executive staff are retained by board members.

THE PRESENT COMPARTMENTAL SYSTEM

There is abundant evidence in the records of the board that this compartmental system of school administration has decided disadvantages, and that the different branches of the board's activity, like the branches of a tree, grow constantly farther away from each other. There is no executive officer charged with the duty of relating the work of the various bureaus of the system. The City Superintendent is popularly supposed to have this duty, and public opinion holds him responsible for everything that invites criticism in connection with the schools; but he is only one of several executive officers of the board, and his jurisdiction does not extend beyond his own division. This compartmental system calls for a general manager to relate its parts and to solve problems which arise as to their relations. In the nature of the case the Board of Education cannot supply such a unification of the work of its committees and their bureaus under the present system. Matters which call for decision must be continually referred and re-referred, and differences of opinion on the part of committees may block action altogether.

Illustrations of all this abound. The Committee on Buildings refers to the Elementary Schools Committee the question as to whether couches shall be a part of the regular equipment for classes of crippled children. Some microscopes are stolen from a high school, and upon the Superintendent of School Supplies falls the duty of recovering them. The Board of Superintendents suggests the dropping of various items from the lists of supplies furnished to the schools; the Committee on Supplies must decide the matter. The Committee on High Schools requests the Building Committee to investigate the advisability of installing formaldehyde disinfecting and vacuum cleaning plants in all future new high schools. The High School Committee advises the Committee on Supplies that it should not count upon appropriations from the Bonus Fund (a state fund

supplied for high school betterment) for the purchasing of regular supplies for the high schools unless by previous arrangement with the Committee on High Schools. The Supplies Committee asks the Finance Committee to transfer the unassigned balances in the salary funds of the several bureaus to the account for salaries of district superintendents' clerks, that it may increase such salaries. Reply is made that other departments are equally needy and their funds should not be taken from them. The Finance Committee asks for certain promotions, and the creation of one new position in the Bureau of Audit and Account. The Supplies Committee lays the matter on the table, and the chairman of the Finance Committee has to appear and appeal for action before action is taken. The Russian Government invites the city to send an exhibit to the International Industrial Exhibition. The City Superintendent recommends that the city shall exhibit under one class only — school architecture. The Superintendent of School Buildings reports that, in his opinion, an exhibit without the school activities conducted in them will be meaningless. The committee must decide which report it shall accept; but if these two officers had been compelled to talk the matter over before reporting on it a single and not a contradictory report could have been submitted.

Great delays are caused by the necessity of referring matters to other departments of the service, other committees, other boards, other bureaus, etc. A long time usually intervenes between the initiation of a matter and its final disposal when it must take this course. There is no one to push the special report which has been asked for; thus extraordinary matters take much more time than ordinary ones. The calendars of the various committees are well kept. Items which have been referred to other agencies, or on which final action has not been taken, reappear on each consecutive calendar until they are finally cleared up. This excellent custom is not followed by the Board of Education. Matters that are referred to its committees sometimes disappear

from its calendar altogether, and in no case reappear there until the committee in charge of them gets a place for them by making its report. If the committee chooses to do so, it may take no action at all, or take negative action without reporting the matter back to the board.

COMMITTEES SHOULD REPORT ACTION TO THE BOARD

For example, the several recommendations for action on the part of the board which the City Superintendent made in his report for 1910 were referred to the appropriate committees, and, so far as I can discover, no mention is made of them again in the journal of the board for the year. It seems to us that it would be much wiser for the board to carry all its unfinished business on its calendar until it can be finally disposed of; and, also, if the present committees are to be retained, for each committee to state its needs for information from other committees, and its requirements for action on their part, not to them directly, but in a report to the Board of Education, which can then be referred to them by the board. The committees are creations of the board, and are responsible to it but not to each other; what they control they control through it, and what they do should be done through it. As it is now, the responsibility for initiating action is, in large part, left to them, and upon them rests the final determination of many matters, the deciding of which belongs to the whole board, and which is now not even reported to it by the committee. This is particularly the case in all matters referred to them for consideration and report; but, even in the case of matters referred to them with power to act, a report stating that action has been taken, and what it is, should be submitted by them for the information of their fellow-members and the public, and to complete the record of the board. Examples of action by committees on matters upon which the board itself should have acted might be included. The following will suffice to show that the method is an unsatisfactory one.

Changes are made in the conduct of the schools from time to time which involve considerable outlays for supplies not provided for in the budget. A preliminary discussion of ways and means would seem to be necessary before such changes are authorized, or the present under-financed condition of the system should be changed.

A communication from the secretary of the Central Committee of Local School Boards of Manhattan stated that, at a meeting of said committee, held on October 10, 1911, attention was called to the fact that a closer relation could be established between the local school boards and the schools if the names of the local school board members were better known, and that action was taken requesting the Board of Education to take the necessary steps to have the names of the members of the local school boards posted on the bulletin boards in the schools in their respective districts. It was moved and adopted that the above-mentioned committee be informed that the Committee on Elementary Schools believes that as each principal has in his or her possession a directory containing the names and addresses of members of local school boards, which may be consulted by teachers and others, further steps in the matter are unnecessary.

February 14, 1911. — A communication from the City Superintendent transmitted a letter from an Associate Superintendent stating that the Committee on School Management of the Board of Superintendents is unanimous in the opinion that the by-laws of the Board of Education encourage absence and that the deduction of 1/360 of a year's pay where a teacher has been absent 1/160 of a whole year, and the practice of continuing to pay for services not rendered, are distinct incentives to irregular attendance; that the charter permits a ratable deduction for absence which would mean no service, no pay, with liberal, generous refunds where proper; and that the last-named committee is unanimous in the opinion that another attempt should be made to bring about such a method of payment

as will radically cure this absence evil, etc. The Committee on By-laws ordered this communication to be noted in its minutes and placed on file. The request to be informed whether the committee desires the Board of Superintendents to prepare amendments to the by-laws in this particular is thus disposed of. Under date of January 10, 1912, it did finally submit a resolution, which the board adopted, authorizing a deduction for unexcused absence from duty at the rate of 1/200 part of the annual salary for each day so absent.

The Committee on School Buildings recommends that the duty of inspecting janitors' inventories be transferred to the Care of Buildings Committee, and thus let all the responsibility for the contents of buildings rest entirely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Care of Buildings. Ordered that the Committee on Buildings be advised that the Committee on By-laws does not deem it advisable to have the matter of verification and approval of inventories placed under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Care of Buildings.

DUPLICATION OF WORK

A considerable duplication of work is involved in this committee method of handling business. One committee recommends action upon the basis of a report from a member of its staff; this, perhaps, involves another committee, in which case it details an inspector from its staff to go over the same ground and make a report to it. In some cases this is desirable and necessary; in some cases it is not, and is done because of the principle of independent authority which has grown up. We can but feel if the executive staff were regarded as one staff and the general manager of the whole undertaking had detailed a man to make a report as to a given need, it would not be necessary for another department to take the matter up in the same way again.

THE MOST SERIOUS FAULT

But the most serious fault of the committee system is that it prevents the board from transacting its business as a board, upon consideration of it by the whole board; that it substitutes for the initiative of all the members the initiative of a part of them, and trusts to a minority of the body the first-hand determination of its policies and decisions. The Revised Charter recognized the fact that a board of forty-six members is too unwieldy to function in this capacity, by directing it to appoint an executive committee of fifteen members, who, with the approval of the board, should care for the government and management of the public school system, such committee to have power, when authorized by the board, to perform any of its administrative functions. The charter directs (1063) also that all reports of the committees of the board shall be presented to the executive committee for its consideration and action before being presented to the board, unless otherwise ordered by the board. This provision the board has found to be an unworkable one, and so has abandoned it. The executive committee is appointed at the regular time for its appointment. It is called to order regularly at the time fixed for its meeting, but as regularly adjourns without business to transact, save in the months of July and August, when the members of the board are absent from the city, at which time the executive committee transacts the business of the board. This committee, then, cannot function as a policy-making body. The Board of Education of forty-six members and its fourteen committees constitute the administrative device which heads the system. This arrangement is unsatisfactory, and, while it might be improved by a re-defining of the functions of the board and of its committees, there is imperative need for a school board which is small enough to be its own executive committee, and to provide a unified and energetic administration for the schools.

THE EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR SHOULD HAVE MORE POWER

The maintenance of every large corporate undertaking, whether public or private, in the last analysis rests upon the administrative staff which the board employs. The board itself can do very little more than advise with its department heads, make a general policy for them to follow and arrange, and systematize their work and the law which governs it, so that they may have a clear and determinate responsibility, freedom in which to function, and such help as may be needed. Neither the charter nor the by-laws of the board define the functions of the City Superintendent of Schools in such a way as to give him an authority at all commensurate with his *de facto* responsibility. One searches in vain through their provisions for anything like an adequate definition of his functions. He is so restricted and bound down by the necessity of consulting members of the board of examiners, heads of independent bureaus, members of the Board of Education, and officers of the departments of the city government that, strictly speaking, he has no authority whatever to guide and direct the schools. When school buildings are to be built, they are to be buildings for schools; yet the Superintendent of Schools has little organic relation to the bureau which builds them. It is everywhere acknowledged that New York has been more successful, perhaps, than any other city in building school houses; but her success is due to the splendid personnel of her building staff, and to the fact that this division has worked in the closest and most intimate way with the Superintendent of Schools, and not to any provision of the laws or the by-laws which makes necessary such a relation between the essential parts of one whole.

Just so there is no sufficient organic relation between the Bureau of Supplies and the Superintendent's office. The supplies are furnished for educational reasons and must meet educational requirements. The system must be one and not two at this point. The method by which supplies

are furnished, the quality and quantity of the supplies which are furnished, and the promptitude with which they are furnished are all educational questions as well as matters of the economy of the Supply Bureau.

The proper organization of reports and statistical information, too, is an educational interest, as well as an accounting interest. Much confusion has arisen from the too complete separation of these functions which are organic parts of one undertaking. Since that undertaking in all its parts is educational, it should be organized to serve that one purpose. It cannot be so organized until the educational direction shall guide the work of all the other divisions. The Superintendent of Schools must be the general manager and resident director of the entire system. This does not mean that he should do what is now done by other bureaus, but only that he should be given sufficient authority to make the coördinations which are now made unofficially, or not at all in the system. Building operations, supply operations, and accounting operations must still be carried on as before, but hitches should be eliminated, duplicating made unnecessary, advice and counsel given when needed, and unity and coöperation of effort maintained by some one with authority who is on the ground all the time. The present necessity of referring such interdepartmental matters to different committees of the Board of Education is not a method of settling them; but, since each department is regulated by its own committee, which naturally is more familiar with its own work (and more interested in it) than with that of any other committee, it is a method of keeping the several bureaus unrelated and apart. There are no conferences of bureau chiefs, for no one person has the authority and the duty to call such conferences. Yet the department heads recognize the necessity of talking their work over together and devising means and ways of relating and integrating it. A general manager is indispensable to every coöperative undertaking. The qualification of the man needed in each case is determined by the

character of the undertaking; for railroading a railroad expert, for banking a banker, and for education an educational expert. It is futile to say that no one man has the equipment for such a post, or that the task is too large for any one person; that this is too much authority to give to any one person. One man guides the executive department of the entire national government. The education of the entire state is directed by a single commissioner of education. And in Europe the educational affairs of whole nations are intrusted to a single minister of education. Education, too, has produced men of the first order, whose capacity for service as superintendents of schools and presidents of universities has abundantly proven that educators may have as high administrative ability as the leaders of other callings. The records of the nation do not show that administrative talent is a monopoly of the business man; and a business man as general manager of the largest school system in the United States would certainly not be the educational leader which the work demands.

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT INADEQUATELY DEFINED

One hunts in vain through the laws and by-laws for such a recognition of the functions of the Superintendent of Schools. He has a seat on the board, but no vote; he reports on the needs and conditions of the schools, he inspects them, and encourages teachers and pupils; he prescribes blank forms for reports; he makes an annual report; is chairman of the Board of Superintendents; holds conferences, assigns superintendents to duty subject to the by-laws of the board, is chairman of the Board of Examiners, nominates members of this board, enforces compulsory education, is a member of the Board of Retirement and of the Permanent Census Board, and appoints and dismisses members of the clerical force in his office, subject to confirmation by the Board of Education.

Is this a sufficient statement of the powers and functions

of the office which must in the nature of the case direct the educational work of the largest city in the nation? What may the Superintendent on his own authority do? Just two things: he may determine the time, the subjects, and the lowest passing mark of the examinations, and after candidates have passed them he may renew their licenses or cut them off if their work is unsatisfactory. Yet this is the office which is logically the directive one in the system, the office which is held responsible by the people for the welfare of the schools, and the office which must bear the brunt of the criticism which is leveled against the system. The Superintendent of Schools of New York City should exercise a power commensurate with his office. His opportunities for educational service should be recognized as greater than those of any half dozen university presidents; and, in qualification, authority, salary, and all that is necessary to make an office adequate to lead the largest educational undertaking of the country, his post should be one of the highest in the land. He should be the superintendent and general manager of the schools, having the advice and direction of a small non-political board of education commissioned by the people to do all things needful to secure the expert direction of the schools, but, by no means, to direct them themselves.

THE GENERAL MANAGER'S STAFF

All the officers below the Board of Education should belong to the general manager's staff. For the direction and guidance of instruction he should nominate for appointment by the Board of Education a corps of assistants of his own selection, whose duties he should assign and re-assign to them as occasion demands. They should be his aides and form his cabinet, but the final responsibility for recommending the establishment of the schools, the necessary changes in classes, lists of eligibles for appointment, the assigning of teachers, the rules for the promotion of pupils,

the course of study, and all other technical matters, should rest upon the Superintendent. This responsibility should not be committed, as it is at present, to a board of nine men not selected by the educational head of the schools, of which the City Superintendent is but one without more authority than the others on the board, which decides the educational direction of the system by a majority vote of its members. This administrative device seems to be only one further expression of the bureaucratic tendency of the school administration of New York City. The principle which seems to have dictated such an arrangement has already been called the method of government by diffusion of responsibility, or the principle of never appointing one man to look after a responsibility if several can be put in charge of it; and if, by any chance, one man must be selected to head a division, to see to it that he shall by no means be anything but a titular head by appointing a number of associates who shall prevent him from exercising more than the nominal functions of his office. Educational advancement and educational security are not to be gotten in this way. A simplification of machinery is necessary.

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE GENERAL MANAGER

As general manager the Superintendent of Schools should have authority to call together the heads of the several administrative bureaus for the clearing of their interbureau difficulties and for the discussion of plans for the betterment of the service. It is conceived that no great part of his time will be required for the oversight of these capably manned divisions. What is wanted is not time for minute direction of their affairs, but authority to settle matters of procedure and details of action which must now go to the board for decision, and to expedite reciprocal obligations; to keep matters which must go through several bureaus moving as rapidly as possible, and to answer the recurring question: "What is best to be done in this case?"

Such a general manager would keep the Board of Edu-

cation up to its duty of looking out for the welfare of the entire system, of defending the education law, and enforcing it, of securing funds enough to run the schools, of making plans for the enlargement of the plant, and the internal development of the system, and of defining its own functions and those of the different members of its staff. His duty would be to keep routine work which the officers can attend to away from the board, and, at the same time, to keep before the board the important questions which it must handle for the good of the system. "What is everybody's business is nobody's business" is all too thoroughly evidenced now in the absence of such a general direction of affairs. One person charged with the ordering of business could soon work most of the needed reforms.

THE BOARD NOT IN CLOSE TOUCH WITH ITS WORK

The board is not able to keep a constant oversight of its own affairs, and when criticism is made of special phases of its work it is driven to the expedient of appointing special committees of its members to investigate what is being done and recommend what should be done. It took this method of determining whether its schools were being ventilated, a little while ago; and just recently it has taken this method of finding out whether the Board of Examiners is performing its duties as it would have it perform them. This of itself is a confession of the inadequacy of administrative machinery. No special inquiry should have been needed to determine whether the schools are properly ventilated, or how to ventilate them, for that should be a matter of constant inquiry. Regular records and repeated reports should have kept the board well informed on both points. The same is true with regard to the action of the Board of Examiners; the board should itself have known what was being done as part of its regularly supplied information and should, by establishing its own policy upon the practices in question, have prevented any need for a special investi-

gation at any time. It is only when the board attempts to do more than it can do, or attempts to do it without the requisite staff, that such after-the-fact consideration of its acts is necessary.

We do not find the proper separation of functions recognized in its work. The first-hand making of a course of study it seems to regard as its own duty, rather than that of the Superintendent. It does not sufficiently support the agents whom it itself has commissioned to perform certain work. The Superintendent of Schools is as liable to nagging or baiting by certain members of the New York City Board of Education as if he were in a smaller and less civilized community. There is no justification for this whatever. The school business should be conducted with dignity and consideration. Whatever else a board of education may do, or not do, it should not allow itself to lower the general regard for the appointed officers of public instruction. Some consideration, too, should be paid to methods to be followed in introducing such changes as it may desire to bring about in the administration of the work under its care. The question of function should, at any rate, be settled before the attack upon what is being done begins. There is so little reason for acrimonious debate in conducting the affairs of a school system, and so much of it is indulged in, that one of the first duties of a school board is to deliberate upon ways and means of eliminating it altogether and then to stick to the results of its deliberations.

Another confusion-breeding result of a disorganized system is that the complaint department is not located in the general offices of the Board of Education, but in the office of each member who chooses to entertain the complaints which may be brought to him. For self-protection most undertakings have found it necessary to appoint ways and means for the reception and consideration of complaints against the corporate service. No large undertaking which affects multitudes of people can hope to be free from them, but it can keep them from demoralizing its services if it

handles them properly. The city Board of Education has a duty in this direction.

ADMINISTRATION PREVENTED BY TOO MANY LAWS

It is perhaps incident to a large system of public education which has grown up as the New York City school system has, that a multiplicity of laws should have been developed to control the administrative details of the system, and that many of these laws should in time become unworkable, and should take away from the administrative body the control of the very affairs which it is its duty to direct. In that case, not the living intelligence, but the dead hand of the past is given control. There seems to be no way of freeing the undertaking from being unreasonably bound by outworn laws and regulations except to exercise as much care in procuring the repeal of hindering legislation as in the passing of new laws. A codification of the school laws which control the Board of Education would reveal a mass of such enactments, and would be the first step in eliminating them and so freeing the administration to meet present day necessities. For this, and for other legal services, the Board of Education should have its own legal adviser, a salaried attorney whose services would be constantly available to protect the legal interests of the school department. The Corporation Counsel is the legal defender of the municipal corporation. The Board of Education is a separate corporation and requires a defender of its own.

The school system of New York City is an inbreeding system. There is a fence about it which has been made into a wall by the recent action prohibiting the merging of eligible lists. This ought, in justice to the children, to be broken down. There should be no preferential tariff to keep out the best teachers from other places. Instead, the school department should keep recruiting agents in the field to secure the services of the best teachers who are anywhere available. Teachers everywhere should know that New

York City is constantly searching for the best teachers in the entire United States, and the same free trade in appointments should apply to the supervisory and superintending staff. And there are not enough outlets to the system. Rarely, very rarely, is a teacher discharged; and rarely, very rarely, does it happen that a temporary certificate is not made into a permanent license. Tenure of office during efficiency of service is desirable; but tenure of office which becomes permanency without regard to efficiency is good neither for teachers nor for their pupils. There is need for a readjustment in this particular in the schools of New York City.

MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The Board of Education suffers, as has been pointed out, because its work is parceled out to other city departments. One further example of this defective form of school administration is found in the medical examination of school children.

The responsibility for conducting the medical examination of school children to discover physical defects which interfere with their progress in education is intrusted to the Department of Health. The results of this dismemberment are unsatisfactory, as the principle is a bad one. Only 287,871 out of 603,455 in average attendance were examined during the year, and out of 299,184 defects which were found only 152,941 were reported as remedied. It is now a fairly well-established principle in American public school education that the school administration must control and direct all the activities which pertain to the work of the school. It must control and direct them because its work is one, and its parts cannot possibly be fitted together and made to coöperate and mutually support each other until they are directed to one and the same end by the responsible administrator of the schools.

CHAPTER IX

REPORTING UPON COST

THE Board of Education has been repeatedly urged to report the cost per unit of its total expenditures for education. Those who have been most insistent in this demand seemingly have regarded the task as an easy one which, at most, would involve the addition of a new department, and the collecting and tabulating of a few more records than are now kept, instead of a more or less complete reorganization of the present system of school administration. Elaborate tables of cost, based upon the average daily attendance, are kept, and have been kept for years. A well-equipped and efficient statistical department has been organized, and all the information as to cost, based upon the unit of average daily attendance, which the most demanding critic can ask for, is available. This division is undermanned and its experts are underpaid. Appropriations have not been provided to make possible the more elaborate statistical studies which have been asked for, and the demands for more statistical information have become most insistent at the very time that appropriations with which to supply it have been withheld.

The request of the City Superintendent for an appropriation which would enable the board to employ a statistician for his office has been denied. But the employment of even a number of additional statisticians would not furnish the facts. What is needed is much more fundamental than that; it is nothing short of the elaboration of a method by studies and investigations running through a series of years, which shall be adequate to determine the standard units which must be used to measure the results of edu-

cational activity. It is one thing to compute the cost of education quantitatively and quite another thing to compute its cost qualitatively; but only the latter figures are of any real significance, and without them the others would be misleading. It is comparatively easy to write a formula for scientific school accounting; simply divide the results obtained by the cost. But what are the results obtained? Until they are exhaustively standardized and reliably reported, any refinement of cost accounting will furnish only delusive figures. There are figures at hand to show the cost of cleaning the school houses, but they do not show that the school houses are clean. What is much more important in this respect is the adoption of up-to-date methods of making them sanitary. There are figures which show the present cost per pupil in average daily attendance for the heating of the buildings; but elaborate and long-continued investigations under the direction of a heating expert are necessary before the actual conditions of the heating machinery and the results obtained will furnish scientific standards and accurate cost units of heating. The cost of ventilating the schools as they are now ventilated can be arrived at; but other means must be employed before they are ventilated properly, and it is only the cost of proper ventilation which is of directive value.

The cost of furnishing the schools with the equipment necessary to obtain standard results is greatly to be desired; but that depends upon a previous standardizing of educational results to be striven for; and that is a matter which concerns the entire educational profession, and is being worked out laboriously in well-equipped laboratories and in class rooms throughout the world. New York City undoubtedly has not done its share in investigating these matters. For one reason or another it has confined itself to routine ways and means, and has not been free to employ the most scientific ways and means that have been perfected. And, because the results obtained in education are different in kind from the results sought and obtained in highly

organized manufacturing processes, it is manifestly unfair to assume that cost accounting in school administration is on all fours with cost accounting in business enterprises. What must be measured is not the number of dollars spent, but the educational results obtained. To save money is not the object of the undertaking. From the standpoint of dollars only, the greatest immediate saving would be brought about by closing the schools altogether. The greatest real saving consists in making the best educational investment possible. The cost of a given policy must be equated with the results of that policy and the accurate determination of the results is necessary before the cost can be arrived at.

REAL COST ACCOUNTING OF EDUCATION A SCIENTIFIC MATTER

Real cost accounting in education is, therefore, a much more difficult scientific matter than it is in banking, railway, or insurance offices. Figures that superficially compare subject with subject, class with class, school with school, department with department, borough with borough, are more apt to be misleading than to be informing unless the differences in conditions which the figures do not disclose are kept in mind. Nevertheless, though it is vastly more difficult to introduce scientific management into school keeping, scientific management must be introduced there. It must, however, be done by educators, and must be the scientific management of education and not the scientific management of bookkeeping merely. First, and for many years to come, attention must be given to standardizing results. Meantime all figures as to cost must be interpreted as applying to an indefinite something which, without further qualification, is just as likely to be the absence of education as its reality. In other words, all dollar figures are provisional, and may report a fact which demands consideration or may not. As long as principals and teachers draw different

salary rates according to length and character of experience a comparison of the total cost of school with school will not be particularly illuminating.

THE ACCEPTED STANDARD

To escape the errors which must arise from comparing an unknown part with an unknown part, the most truthful method of reporting school cost at present is to regard the whole system as one school with a known average attendance, the expense of whose several functions can be readily determined. The reason why this is the method regularly employed by school departments is because it is the only one which gives a true account of conditions. The true unit is the whole system. One can hardly keep an accurate account of the money he must spend for food for his hand or his head, and any calculation which he might make would be of but little value. He must, however, if he is careful, keep an account of the cost of gloves, of hats, and of barbering, for purposes of keeping each item to its proper figures. Yet, at the end of the year, it is the total expense that really concerns him. Just so for purposes of administrative detail trial balances must be made throughout the year, and the cost of school must be compared with the cost of school, item by item, to keep waste from the system; but this belongs to the domestic economy of the department and not to its final accounting. If demand is made for all these figures they can, of course, be furnished, but they must be anatomized before they will have meaning.

THE PROPER UNIT

It has been suggested that the proper unit for calculating educational expenditures is not the cost per child in average daily attendance, but the cost per student hour of instruction. Such a basis of reckoning would enable us to determine just what outlay instruction in each subject which

is studied necessitates. It would then be possible to say the teaching of arithmetic costs New York City just so much; the teaching of reading just so much; the teaching of music, German, manual training, etc., so much; the teaching of first-grade children so much; the teaching of eighth-grade children so much, etc. Such a method of reporting the cost of education has been planned, but has not as yet been carried out for the simple reason that sufficient clerical help was not available for the purpose. Figures can be made, but are not now available, which will show the cost of instruction in each subject and the cost of instruction in each grade. They would have but little immediate value; for courses of study are not, and should not be, determined by cost, but rather by the educational value of the subjects which find a place in them. Their cost is one element in determining their value, but only one. It should undoubtedly be worked out and placed beside them so that it may help in determining what they are worth. But there is grave danger that, if it is not carefully handled, it may be used to overthrow, rather than to build up, a rational educational procedure. Because they do enter as a factor in determining what courses of study should be, the Auditor's statistical division is planning to make them just as soon as his staff can be spared for that work.

NEED FOR A BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The accurate investigation of the educational value of what is attempted and what is accomplished is a more pressing necessity. Special agencies should be created for this purpose. The administrative officers in charge of the system are too much occupied with the daily work upon which they are engaged to handle this satisfactorily. Occupation with administrative details necessitates a trend of interest and an absorption in what must be done which does not allow freedom for the kind of scientific investigation which is required.

On November 8, 1911, Mr. Alfred Mosely, in addressing the Board of Education, made the following recommendation: "I should like to throw out one suggestion, and it is an important one, one relating to a matter in which, I think, we in England have been ahead of you for some considerable time. . . . I refer to a special department of inquiry. . . . Unless you are going to see what is being done in all parts of the world, unless you have a special appropriation — not of a large amount, of quite a modest sum — to enable you to send scouts the world over, to Europe, or through the United States, to see what is being done, you cannot keep yourselves up-to-date. Many of you are business men, and I will ask you what would become of your business unless you took care to avail yourself of every new invention, of every new idea in any other part of the world that might be started? Unless you had your travelers and delegates out to get information for you as to all that is being done you would fall behind; your business would go and you would lose in the race. . . . You cannot afford nowadays to be without information from all parts of the world as to the forward movements that are being made. Now, if I may be allowed to emphasize this point, I think it would be well if you were to pass a resolution — either now or at some later date — for a special appropriation in order that you may send the best minds you can secure in this country to other parts of the world to report to you all that they see in new methods. I think it would be distinctly a gain and add to the efficiency of this Department of Education."

No resolution such as Mr. Mosely urged was introduced at that meeting or at any subsequent one. The matter was not even referred to a committee for consideration. Yet the great interest which the man who made the recommendation has taken in furthering the cause of education, as well as the evident value of the suggestion itself, demanded consideration for it.

New York City now spends about \$34,000,000 per annum

upon public education, in addition to a building fund of \$12,000,000. It has no Bureau of Standards, no division for investigations which would lead to a more careful appraisal of educational results, and no agency whose specific duty it is to gather information and make reports upon improvements which are being introduced in the schools of other places. Such an agency should be created to assist the superintendents in their work. Its main business should be to devise scientific standards with which to measure educational results and, by their aid, to determine the value of the instruction which is being given. This undertaking is large enough to have its own testing "engineer" to help the superintendents to standardize the product. The qualifications of such a man are different from those of a superintendent. He is to be a laboratory worker, skilful in devising experiments which will measure what is being done, and skilful also in drawing conclusions of directive value from the investigations which he conducts. The superintendents are not free for this intensive study, phase by phase, of the different features of the system. He is to have nothing else to do, and is to do a work similar to that of a consulting chemist for the department. As a necessary part of his duty he should report the results of scientific investigations which are being made throughout the world, and, without having any administrative responsibility whatever, he should make himself an authority upon ways and means of educational betterment which are being introduced in other places. Such a division of appraisal and standards should work in connection with the superintendents, and, with their help, should prepare and furnish such knowledge as is anywhere available or can be made available for a more scientific determination of school results.

The figures which such a division would furnish seem to me to be vastly more important to an undertaking devoted to education than elaborate cost tables which play the figure-making game through all possible combinations of financial

income and outlay. Indeed, scientific management in education must concern itself with the product and the character of the work done rather than with the permutations which are possible in tabulating and retabulating educational expenditures. The Board of Education should, therefore, have its own educational research division.¹

ONE STATISTICAL DIVISION

The statistics of all the different bureaus and boards should be handled by one statistical division. All statistical reports of whatever sort should go to it for tabulation. The manufacturing of tables of every description which report summaries of conditions should be committed to it. The different bureaus should furnish it with the data from which tables are to be prepared, but it alone should do the work of preparing them. Much confusion occurs, and is bound to occur, when each division prepares and makes public its own departmental figures for the system. This can be entirely obviated if one division alone is made responsible for the preparation of all statistical reports. High-grade statistical service is required to do this work, and a staff large enough to do all that there is to be done is needed; but accurate and thoroughly consistent statistical tables come only from a thoroughly systematized process of preparing them.

¹ See also Professor Elliott's recommendation concerning a "Bureau of Investigation and Appraisal."

CHAPTER X

THE PRINTED REPORTS AND RECORDS OF THE BOARD

THERE is one persistent source of confusion in the statistics which are published by the Board of Education. The fiscal year of the city and the school year of the state do not synchronize. The fiscal year begins on January 1, the school year on August 1.

Section 1094 of the charter directs the Board of Education, between the 1st day of August and the 30th day of September in each year, "to make and transmit to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state school year ending on the next preceding 31st day of July reports which shall be in such form and shall state such facts as the State Superintendent and the school laws of the state shall require."

Section 1095 of the charter directs that the Board of Education, between the 1st day of August and the 30th day of November, shall report to the Mayor in writing, stating the number of schools under its jurisdiction during the year ending on the 31st day of July next preceding, the number of teachers, the number of pupils on the register in average daily attendance, etc. The Board of Education shall also, between the 1st day of January and the 15th day of February in each year, make and transmit to the Mayor of the City of New York another report bearing date the 31st day of December next preceding, stating the total amount of money expended for the purposes of public education in said city during the year ending on said 31st day of December.

Complying with these requirements of law, the Board of Education regularly submits an educational report and

a financial report, the one prepared by the Superintendent of Schools covering the period from August 1 to July 31 of the following year, and the other prepared by the Auditor of the board, from January 1 to December 31. Both include financial statistics. A more confusing form of reporting could not easily be devised.

The difficulty might be obviated by the Superintendent omitting all references to cost and the expenditure of money from his report, and furnishing no figures save those which refer to enrollment, attendance, etc. But the trouble is that that would not be an educational report in the accepted sense. Printed school reports circulate among school officers in all parts of the country. One of their chief points of value consists in the comparisons of educational cost which they offer. The Superintendent's report would lose a large part of its value if this feature were omitted from it. On the other hand, the statements of cost which the board issues must be self-consistent and not contradictory. No other feature of the system is so eagerly attacked as discrepancies in the figures of cost which it publishes. Two sets of figures should never be published, for no amount of explaining that they are made for different periods will obviate confusion. What is the way out of this difficulty?

Since the fiscal year is fixed and the school year is fixed, to make them coterminous is not to be thought of. But the report which the Superintendent of Schools must make for the State Commissioner of Education might be submitted without being printed by the board; and the elaborate report which the Superintendent prepares for print might cover the school activities for the fiscal year. This would require the preparation by his office of a third report — one for the Commissioner of Education, one for the Mayor, both of them statistical and both covering the period from August 1 to August 1, and the third one descriptive and statistical, covering the calendar year. The only alternative to this plan for eliminating the confusion of two sets of published figures of school cost would be

the elimination of all reference to cost from the printed report of the Superintendent of Schools. But, as already stated, this robs it of a large part of its value as a school document; and the other method commends itself as preferable.

Only three thousand copies of the report of the Superintendent of Schools are printed. A regular mailing list is kept, and they are distributed to the officers of the system and to libraries and school authorities throughout the world. It is a question whether or not they should be provided for each teacher in the system. The cost of doing so would be considerable, and perhaps the larger part of them so distributed would be wasted. Yet, since they are of value to those who would keep themselves informed as to the development of the system, enough copies should be printed to furnish a copy to all who have interest enough to ask for one. This would, perhaps, necessitate a larger edition, which in that case should be provided.

The official journals of the board are printed and distributed as follows:

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

26	District Superintendents
230	Members of Local School Boards
46	Members of the Board of Education
50	Board Room
3	Building Bureau
12	City Superintendent
7	Auditor
2	Supply Bureau
6	Secretary's Office
2	Supervisor of Free Lectures
100	Miscellaneous list
300	Held for binding
216	Surplus

1,000

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUILDINGS

46	Members of the Board
26	District Superintendents
40	Building Bureau
7	Deputy Superintendent of School Buildings
12	Secretary's Office
7	Auditor
12	City Superintendent
50	Held for binding

 200

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

46	Members of the Board
49	District Superintendents and Local School Boards
9	On file for Committee on Elementary Schools
4	Secretary's Office
12	City Superintendent
1	Auditor
1	Superintendent of Buildings
25	Held for binding
3	Surplus

 150

A large school system such as this is must rely upon its printed records and reports to furnish the members of its staff with information concerning matters of common interest as to the working of the system. The unity of understanding which should be built up depends upon the accessibility of the means of information concerning the system to its different parts. It seems to us that too great economy is used in printing the minutes of the Board of Education,

that at least enough copies should be printed to furnish one to be put on file in an available place in each school.

The minutes of the board should supply more information than they now do. The more important communications should be printed in full. Summary financial reports should appear regularly in them. There is no call to expand them beyond a few pages; but some matters of great importance do not now find a place in them. Among these are the very carefully constructed special reports which executive officers of the system are from time to time called upon to make. The action of committees upon all matters referred to them should also appear in the minutes, to make the record of the board upon all matters which have been before it complete. The minutes should be printed in larger type, and the final resolutions of the board in distinctive type; so that one, in going over its records, may see at a glance what action has been taken by it without having to dig out the passages which report the action of the board. The minutes of the board itself, and of all of its committees and subordinate boards, should be indexed to date; and the index should not only apply to the minutes of the year, but it should be a cumulative index covering the published reports and minutes of a period of years, and constantly revised and brought up to date by the inclusion of each new transaction on which action is taken. The constant making of such an index is a task which only an expert can handle.

The preparation of all reports and minutes for print is a work which should be cared for by an expert. Again, the proper filing of the records of the several bureaus of the board, after such records are no longer in daily use, requires an expert. Though they refer, in part, to different phases of the same transactions, each bureau now files its own records; and to follow any single operation from its beginning to its conclusion necessitates an appeal to several departments and the help of a great number of clerks. The process would be greatly simplified for the members of the office staff who must hunt these records for their own pur-

poses, as well as for the public, if the filing of all records, documents, books, etc., were done in one place and were the work of a thoroughly trained filing division.

A DIVISION OF RECORDS NEEDED

To perfect these three activities of the service, the mechanical preparation and oversight of all printed records and reports, the making and keeping of cumulative indices of them, and the filing and supervision of all records after they have ceased to be in constant use, I recommend that a division of records be created with a person properly trained for such work at its head, and that salaries for such assistants as may be necessary to carry it on be arranged for. The reports of the Board of Education, which supply very interesting information concerning its financial, building, and supplies departments, its free lecture system, its nautical school, etc., do not circulate as widely as they should. To get wider publicity for both of its major reports, that of the City Superintendent and that of the board itself, it seems desirable that they should be printed on thin paper and bound together in one volume. At least, a considerable number of copies of the combined report should be prepared in this way. They would show the operation then of the school department as a whole. The report of the board should be printed on time, or more nearly on time, than at present. It was due on the 15th day of February last year (1912), but not transmitted until March 13th, and not printed until much later. To be a vital document it must be kept to its dates. One thousand copies of this report are printed.

CHAPTER XI

HOW ESTIMATES ARE PREPARED

THE adequate financing of public education is much too important a matter to permit impressionism on the part of those who prepare the estimates, or the exercise of arbitrariness, departmental rivalry, personal whim, or anything short of the scientifically investigated necessities of the schools to determine the amount of public money which must be appropriated to the support of public instruction. We have seen that the communities which are foremost in public education in the United States intrust the responsibility of determining the amount of money needed for school purposes to the school authorities. No other method produces satisfactory results, and the experience of New York City supports this conclusion. It is a defect of the charter that a taxing machinery especially applicable to the raising of all the money needed for school purposes is not provided in it. The Board of Education must utilize the financial system devised for general city purposes. To this end it must submit annual estimates of its needs to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, and the budget which that board determines upon must then go to the Board of Aldermen, where it is subject to still further reduction. The security of the public service demands two things: First, that the estimates of the Board of Education shall be scientifically and accurately made, and, second, that nothing but the real needs of the educational service shall determine the budget made for the schools. The application of scientific management to the public service is no less insistent that the second requirement be

met than the first one. The public interest is no better served by the reckless cutting of estimates than by the reckless inflating of them. The responsibility for making them must rest upon the body which administers the affairs of the schools. It must justify every item in them; but the determination of the educational policy of the city must rest with it. If the Board of Education is told that the total amount of money to be devoted to school purposes has been determined before its estimates are considered, it is not the citizens who are being served, but the taxpayers. The claims of the children of the city demand more consideration. Whenever the virtual responsibility for making the educational estimates is intrusted to officials who are unfamiliar with school routine, unaware of school necessities, and unappreciative of school standards, public education will inevitably be crippled.

THE GENERAL LAW CONCERNING SCHOOL FUNDS

The general law of New York State has sought to safeguard the interests of public education by making it the "duty" of the corporate authorities of any incorporated village or city in which a union free school shall be established "to raise, from time to time, by tax to be levied upon all real and personal property in said city or village as by law provided for the defraying of the expenses of its municipal government, such sum as the Board of Education established therein shall declare necessary for teachers' salaries and the ordinary contingent expenses of supporting the schools of said district. The sums so declared necessary shall be set forth in a detailed statement in writing addressed to the corporate authorities by the Board of Education, giving the various purposes of anticipated expenditure, and the amount necessary for each; and the said corporate authorities shall have no power to withhold the sums so declared to be necessary. . . ." (Sec. 327, Education Law of 1910.) We have here the curious

anomaly of boards of education in the smaller districts of New York operating under general laws exercising much larger power and altogether better provided with funds for maintaining the schools under their charge than is the Board of Education in the largest and richest city of the state or the nation, whose finances are controlled by the special law of the charter. Nevertheless, the principle is the same; the Board of Education should determine its own needs, and the tax-appropriating bodies have a duty to make appropriations in keeping with the needs of its service.

THE ELIMINATION OF FRICTION OVER SCHOOL ESTIMATES

It seems certain that the making and submitting of estimates for acceptance by finance-controlling bodies will always be attended by friction, and a considerable amount of bitter and frequently unjustified criticism. The generation of a vigorously hostile attitude and hostile treatment is just as certainly unnecessary and so greatly to be deplored that every condition which fosters it should be removed. This can be done chiefly in two ways: By the Board of Education using every precaution in its power to make its estimates exact and scientific statements of its needs, and by the financial authorities relying upon the Board of Education alone to furnish these estimates, criticising them to the fullest extent when they are submitted, and relying upon them only to determine its appropriations. Confusion is bound to result just as long as estimates prepared by two different bodies, the one responsible for the conduct of the schools and the other not responsible for them, are submitted.

THE TWO SCHOOL BUDGETS

Under the present order of things the Board of Education is required annually to prepare two budgets: The tax budget, for general operation and maintenance, and the

bond budget, covering contemplated items of capital expenditure, such as sites, buildings, and equipment. The annual tax budget is by law separated into two funds or parts, the general school fund, which carries all items directly providing for instruction, and the special school fund, which provides the conditioning necessities of instruction, such as the maintenance and operation of the school plant, school supplies, the salaries of administrative officers and employees, etc.

THE ESTIMATES FOR THE GENERAL FUND

In preparing its estimates for the General Fund, it must list both fixed and variable charges. The salary schedules it can determine from year to year in advance of its estimates. The number of class rooms which it will be required to open, and the number of teachers which it will be required to employ, it cannot compute accurately from six to eighteen months in advance. Population changes in a somewhat unforeseeable way, but, by taking averages of its necessities for a period of past years, it can arrive at an approximation of its needs. This element has hitherto been more uncertain than it need be hereafter. A method for using the figures of past years in approximating it is presented in another section of this report. But the greatest variable in the whole estimate still remains. Teachers are paid according to experience. If none dropped out from year to year it would be quite easy to calculate the advance in salary to which each member of such a permanent force would be entitled during the coming year. Still the rate of pay to which the new teachers, who must be added each year to take care of additional classes, would be entitled could not be exactly foreseen. But the staff is not permanent. Many withdraw from it each year and their places must be filled by new teachers, whose rate of pay will most likely be different and cannot be exactly determined in advance of their appointment. Moreover, there are dif-

ferences in pay according to position. And in addition to these variables, the school department must not merely repeat its conditions of the year before, but it must better them by reducing the size of classes, increasing its provisions for special work, etc. It will thus be seen that any statement of its need of money for instruction must indeed be an estimate, and cannot be an exact forecasting of its coming necessities. How is this estimate made? The Auditor of the Board of Education has supplied the following details of the method employed:

HOW THE ESTIMATES FOR THE GENERAL FUND ARE MADE

The General School Fund Budget is presented in simple form, although it appears complex by reason of its great volume and supporting details. Its salient features are as follows:

1. The salaries of the teachers on the pay-roll on May 31 are tabulated, and their automatic increases are added to December 31 of the same year; therefore, as nearly as can be ascertained in anticipation, the pay-roll at the commencement of the next year for those particular teachers is defined. There is then added the automatic increment for such persons falling due in the fiscal year covered by the budget, the cost for the ensuing fiscal year of filling vacancies existing May 31 is then computed, and, finally, there is inserted an item to cover extra compensation for teaching boys and mixed classes. All of these items are computed by inspection and minute tabulation of each teacher's record, and the results are classified by appropriate grouping by grades and activity. The cost is practically fixed and not subject to variation, and may be considered a first claim upon the fund. The only unknown element is the saving due to withdrawals from the service and replacements at lesser salary, for which adjustment is made from the total of the budget.

2. There is then added, in two parts, an uncertain or

speculative item, namely, the number of teachers estimated to be required to care for enlargements between June and December preceding the fiscal year, the full annual salaries of whom must be provided *for the fiscal year succeeding*; and the estimated number of teachers required for various periods of time to care for enlargements during the fiscal year succeeding. These items are estimated by the Board of Superintendents.

SOME IMPROVEMENTS IN METHOD

It is acknowledged that these last two items are the weak spots in the General Fund estimate. Exact foreknowledge is impossible in regard to them, but a careful averaging of the needs of past years, with a specified margin to provide against the possibility that the coming year may bring heavier demands than the past has brought, would seem to correct these items. Whatever funds are needed for the decrease of the size of the classes should be estimated under that head. Only by so doing can the responsibility for failure to reduce classes to normal limits be fixed. All money required for new projects already planned should be itemized separately. But the betterment of the service should go on from month to month, and not merely from year to year. That superintendents and principals may be constantly incited to bring about such betterment and to be always planning it, there should be a marginal item set apart for this use. The size of this fund need not be large, but should be large enough to be effective. Lack of money forbids unforeseen improvements, and takes away the possibility of making such experiments as the betterment of the service requires. Originality should not be strangled if growth in effectiveness is expected. It may be said that special revenue bonds can be issued at any time if there is any great need for them. They will not be asked for such advancement of the service as could, in the way we are proposing, be secured. A premium must

be put upon the bettering of the schools by expecting it and providing for it in advance, not by forbidding school officials to think of new departures as utterly impractical and not to be thought of from the first.

THE ESTIMATES FOR THE SPECIAL SCHOOL FUND

The form of presentation of the Special School Fund is regulated by the Comptroller's office, and blanks are provided upon which the information which is required must be set forth. They do not entirely make possible the submitting of the needs of the board, but are used with such marginal additions and supplementary statements as are required. The Bureau of Buildings determines its requirements by means of local inspections of school buildings and equipment. Its method, as outlined by the Superintendent of Buildings, is as follows:

HOW THE REPAIR BUDGET IS MADE

The repairs and replacements in the buildings are the largest item, outside of corporate stock work, with which the Committee on Buildings has to deal. It contemplates the maintaining in good order and repair all of the school buildings, together with their sanitary, heating, electric, and furniture equipment.

Various methods have been in use in determining, not so much the items to be included in the budget, as the total amount of which the budget should consist.

When preparing the budget for 1910 the Superintendent of School Buildings presented to the Building Committee a report on the subject, which, in effect, was that, while the details of what was required for each building would vary, yet, treating the matter as a clear business real estate proposition, the sum total of the repairs and maintenance would bear a direct relation to the cost of the property.

After much inquiry and consultation with real estate

experts, this was fixed by the Building Committee at one and one-half per cent of the cost — not value — of the buildings and their equipment.

The cost or value of all sites, whether improved or unimproved, was excluded.

This method of fixing the limit of the sum to be requested received the approval of the Finance Committee and of the Board of Education, and, finally, of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, the 1910 budget being granted on that basis. The cost of the property is given for purpose of comparison. The budget for 1912 was prepared upon this basis.

While the presentation to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment was made in September, and it was discussed in October, its preparation was undertaken during May and June in order to permit the careful examination and collating of the many items in sufficient time for consideration and approval by the committee prior to its being placed before the board.

An examination is made of each building by the various inspectors, who report direct to the Deputy Superintendent of School Buildings for each borough. The items thus presented are considered by the deputy in charge, together with those for work deferred for lack of funds, or that have been directed by the Board of Education or its committees to be included in the budget, care being taken to strike out such items as there is a probability of providing for with the funds in hand.

The totals, however, invariably overrun the limit fixed, and these, after consultation with the Superintendent of School Buildings, are revised until they are brought within the required sum and put in shape for presentation to the Committee on Buildings. The result is a budget of items that will bear examination.

Of course, it is possible to refrain from making certain needful repairs or to defer them indefinitely, but the school plant suffers, and the ultimate expense is far greater than

would have been the case if the work had been done in timely season. Deferred repairs mean extra expense when the work is finally undertaken.

The whole matter of preparation is clearly shown in the letter of instructions issued to the Deputy Superintendents, which, for 1912, here follows:

DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENTS' LETTER NO. 667

NEW YORK, April 12, 1912.

DEAR SIR, — You will please proceed at once to prepare the annual budget for 1913. The same general form as used for 1910, 1911, and 1912 budgets is to be followed, showing in detail, for each building, the work proposed to be done for each of the following items, and the estimated cost thereof:

- General Repairs — Repairs
- General Repairs — Sanitary
- General Repairs — Heating and Ventilating
- General Repairs — Electric
- Furniture and repairs of.

While much work may be deemed desirable you will confine yourself to only that which is necessary.

In addition to this work there is to be added to each of the items of repairs, sanitary, heating, electric, and furniture, the sum of \$20.00, reading:

“Contingent fund for unforeseen emergency repairs, \$20.00.” This will give \$100 for each building for emergency repairs, and any work not otherwise specifically provided for.

As the Board of Estimate and Apportionment decided in 1909 that the total amount to be allowed should not exceed $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the valuation of buildings and equipment, it will obviate the necessity for revising and rewriting the budget for 1913 if the totals of general repairs, and furniture and repairs together, do not exceed that percentage. You will, therefore, please

see that the total amount asked for your borough for these two accounts does not exceed the following:¹

	1911 Valuation	1½ %
Manhattan	\$63,145,755.08	\$947,186.32
The Bronx	12,507,068.15	187,606.02
Brooklyn	44,139,509.23	662,092.63
Queens	12,042,022.38	180,630.33
Richmond	3,261,120.91	48,916.81

In order that the manner of preparation of the field notes shall be uniform throughout the various boroughs

¹ Through a stenographer's error the "sites" item was included in the calculation sent to the deputy superintendents of buildings, whereas only the cost of buildings and equipment should have been included. As a matter of fact the "sites" item was not used, as the tabulation submitted in the printed budget of the Board of Education was as follows:

SPECIAL SCHOOL FUND 1913 (SCHEDULE NO. 12)

REPAIRS AND REPLACEMENTS BY CONTRACT OR OPEN ORDER—DETAILS

Statement showing the Relation of the items for General Repairs and Furniture and Repairs of to One and One-half per cent (1½ %) of the Cost of Buildings and Equipment. The excess of the former over the latter is occasioned by the withholding of sufficient funds for repairs which should have been done in 1912.

	Cost of Buildings and Equipment	One and One-half Per Cent Cost of Buildings and Equipment	Estimate 1913		
			General Repairs	Furniture and Repairs of	Total
Manhattan* . .	\$42,037,021.27	\$630,555.32	\$634,838.00	\$138,876.00	\$773,714.00
The Bronx* . .	10,545,852.85	158,187.79	155,474.00	35,903.00	191,377.00
Brooklyn* . . .	37,703,073.74	565,546.11	582,025.00	80,577.63	662,602.63
Queens*	10,821,972.26	162,329.58	166,680.33	15,191.70	181,872.03
Richmond* . . .	2,953,830.10	44,307.45	53,460.81	3,664.00	57,124.81
Totals	\$104,061,750.22	\$1,560,926.25	\$1,592,478.14	\$274,212.33	\$1,866,690.47

* See Annual Financial and Statistical Report of the Board of Education for the year 1911.

It will be seen that the amount asked for general repairs and furniture and repairs of for 1913 was \$305,764.22 in excess of 1½ per cent of the cost of buildings and equipment, this excess being necessary to partly recoup the cut of \$522,884.18 made by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment in these two items for 1912.

1913 BUDGET		} or one of the other branches of work, as for instance, Heating, Sanitary, Electric or Furniture.
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN REPAIRS		
P. S. 1, 2, 0, 0, 0,	0, 0, 0, 0, 0, etc.	
FIELD NOTES		
John Doe, <i>Inspector</i>		
District.....		
Date1912		

If, for any reason, it be found necessary to change an entry once made the words or figures shall be eliminated only by drawing a pen through them and making the new entry so as not to render the original one illegible.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) C. B. J. SNYDER,

Superintendent of School Buildings.

Aside from the major items of maintenance estimated in this way, there are several special items for which estimates must be provided, such as the following:

"Pianos and Repairs of." There was no allowance for new pianos for the years 1910, 1911, 1912, the sums granted being for repairs, tuning, etc. New instruments are required to replace those which are worn out, and also for kindergarten and other activities.

"Special Heating and Ventilating Fund." This fund is for the purpose of making alterations to the heating and ventilating plants in old school buildings to which new additions are being erected in order properly to connect up and adjust the old and the new plants. This work, prior to 1911, was paid for from Corporate Stock. There was also a "Special Electrical Fund" inserted for the same reason. Both were disallowed, and difficulty and delay were and will be experienced in getting the additions ready for pupils.

The following were inserted upon the recommendation of the Board of Superintendents:

"Equipment of Special Rooms." Science Rooms. This really includes the necessary alterations and changes, together with the installation of a demonstration table, with its special plumbing as required.

"Equipment of Gymnasiums." To equip gymnasiums in old buildings and provide the apparatus in accordance with schedules furnished by the City Superintendent.

"Equipment of Kindergartens." Really means the incidental alterations and changes necessary to fit for that use.

"Equipment of Cooking Rooms." This referred to some of the older buildings, where the cooking rooms have two gas ranges, together with the necessary sinks and closets, and a demonstration table, but without any opportunity for individual work by the pupils, facilities for which it was desired to install in the schools as given.

"Equipment of Workshops." Really includes necessary alterations and changes, together with closets, lumber racks, etc.

“Equipment of Open-air Classes for Anæmic Children.” The changes to be made in the building to accommodate these anæmic classes vary with the conditions. Some will require changes in partitions, closets, and windows; the construction of awnings, platforms, frames, and the installation of desks and chairs, also facilities for cooking, together with refrigerators, closets, and receptacles for dishes and for dry groceries.

“Equipment for Ungraded Classes.” This item includes furniture. Estimated cost of work in these items is always based upon that which has been previously expended for the same, or similar, work.

The items “Equipment of Vocational School for Boys,” and “Equipment of School for the Deaf,” and “For the Blind Pupils” were included in the 1912 budget; also for “Library Bookcases,” being the same as those already supplied for use in the class rooms.

THE ESTIMATES FOR THE SUPPLIES DIVISION

The Bureau of Supplies has maintained a practically uniform appropriation for some years. The items of its estimate are mainly fixed charges. For the year 1912 it asked for the same amount which had been required to carry the schools through the year before. It has reduced the allowance per school to a lower amount, we believe, than is compatible with good educational work. Complaints from parents and principals are numerous that the children are not receiving enough supplies to carry out the course of study. Pupils must purchase many supplies which the board is required by law to furnish, and books must be used by the children which school authorities do not think are in condition to use. What is not yet sufficiently fixed for proper budgetary purposes is the amount which must be allowed for supplies to keep a school in a satisfactory educational condition. Careful investigations by the superintending staff are needed to furnish the basis for accurate figures for this purpose.

The supplies required for increased attendance must, of course, be estimated by the same methods which should be employed to determine the prospective requirements for additional classes. Those that are needed for supplementary activities should be estimated under that head. The office supplies required by the Board of Education are fixed charges which are clearly determined by past needs. Accurate determination of the amount of money actually needed for fuel can be made only upon the basis of such a scientific study of that subject as we have in that connection recommended.

The amounts needed for evening schools, vocational schools, the nautical school, free lectures, vacation recreation centers, playgrounds, etc., are determined by the scope of the activity which it is desired to carry on. The elements of cost are estimated upon the experience of past years. Janitorial service is practically a fixed charge, the only variable element being the number of new classes and of supplementary activities for which funds are to be provided.

SHOULD THE SCHOOL BE USED AS THE UNIT ?

The Finance Department of the city has asked that the annual estimates for 1912 be prepared on the basis of each school as a unit; but the school is not the unit, the system is, and should for purposes of appropriations be studied as one school. To provide a sufficient means for checking the details of estimates it may be well to submit the aggregate payrolls of each school and of each grade in the school; but as the uniformities in grades of salary, according to experience, belong to the system as a whole, and as the principals and teachers of the different schools are compensated at different rates, if their periods of service have been different, it is quite impossible to compare the cost of the schools one by one without furnishing elaborate calculations to account for the differences which appear in their totals.

Again, repairs are not duplicated, and need for them

differs, annually, with the age and character of the buildings. What is done in one school need hardly be repeated there the next year. The number of rooms which must be used in each school is not the same from year to year, and human foresight cannot anticipate the needs of each in this regard. Correspondingly different is the need for janitorial service. Different methods of heating and conditions of machinery require differing quantities of fuel. And such differences as should obtain in interpreting the course of study, and in methods of teaching, require variations in the total cost of supplies among the schools.

HOW THE ESTIMATES SHOULD BE MADE

All estimates should accordingly be based upon the average cost of maintaining the department for a period of years. The figures for each division of the service should be accompanied by a formula to show how they are arrived at. Proposed enlargements and additions to the service should be considered by themselves; and, in the same manner, modifications in the quality of the service should be justified, and unassigned funds should be furnished for the betterment of the service, and to provide a margin for unforeseen necessities, such as new ordinances and new laws involve. An example of the difficulty in which the Board of Education sometimes finds itself, because of the lack of such a margin to meet necessities quite out of its control, was the action of the Board of Health last year in passing an ordinance requiring that sanitary drinking cups be provided by a certain date under penalty of fine or imprisonment, or both. No money was available for this purpose. The board had to request an issue of Special Revenue Bonds, and, while awaiting its coming, had to ask the Board of Health for a special dispensation of time to permit it to comply with the ordinance.

THE GENERAL PROCEDURE IN MAKING ESTIMATES

The general procedure at present in preparing estimates is this: The Finance Committee of the board calls upon each committee in charge of a division of its work to submit to it a statement of its budgetary needs for the coming year. The committee, in turn, directs its executive officer to prepare such a statement of the needs of his division for its approval. When this statement is presented to the committee, it is examined, revised, and approved, and then sent to the Finance Committee of the board. This committee passes upon all such requests for funds, and submits them to the Auditor of the board for criticisms and correction. It directs him to confer with the responsible committee concerning any items about which there is question, and either finally approves or disapproves of their insertion in the budget when he makes his report. The estimates are then put into final shape and submitted to the Board of Education to be adopted and sent by it to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, accompanied by such supporting and explanatory information as it may direct. It is evident that it is the intention of the board and of its officers to furnish any information and to comply with directions as to form of arrangement, statistical tabulations, or other particulars that the Board of Estimate and Apportionment may issue.

THE CORPORATE STOCK BUDGET FOR SITES

The Finance Committee of the Board of Education makes each committee of the board responsible for preparing a statement in detail of the financial needs and requirements of its activity or branch of the school system. The Sites Committee accordingly prepares the first draft of its estimated need for corporate stock. Requests have been coming to it throughout the year from local school boards, civic associations, private individuals, etc., that sites be acquired in specified localities. The committee investigates

the merits of these requests, and, in conjunction with the Board of Superintendents, the High School Committee in the case of sites for high schools, and the Building Committee, it works out its program of expansion for the coming year. Its estimates are then sent to the Finance Committee for insertion in the estimates of the board. The Finance Committee refers them to the Auditor to be checked up and put into form, and then examines them, requiring such conferences with the committee which originated them as it sees fit. It then recommends them to the Board of Education for adoption and transmission to the Finance Department of the city, where they follow the same course as the estimates for new buildings, except that the funds for the purchase of sites remain in the control of a Finance Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

It is felt that the methods used in the past of arriving at the need for sites in definite localities are not sufficiently exact, and, to that end, a plan for the gathering of more definite data, as indicated in another section of this report, is being worked out. It has been suggested that information somewhat as follows should be collected and should accompany each separate case as it comes before the committee for action:

1. School district.
2. Approximate area of district.
3. Schools in operation.
4. Average attendance in the district.
5. Total of three.
6. Number of sittings in each school.
7. Total of five, all schools in district.
8. Number on part time, each school.
9. Total of seven, all schools in district.
10. Vacant sittings each school.
11. Total of nine, all schools in district.
12. Population of school age.
13. Population four to six years of age (future school needs).

14. Remarks covering such points as replacement of old or rented buildings, effect of private or parochial schools on situation, etc., etc.; transportation, etc., between school zones.

THE MAKING OF THE CORPORATE STOCK BUDGET FOR BUILDINGS

Requests are constantly being made by local school boards, civic bodies, individuals, and other agencies, proposing either a new school or an addition to an old school, at this, that, or the other place. These requests are given attention, and such action is taken as the situation seems to warrant. The following are the steps which are taken in the preparation of the Corporate Stock Budget for Buildings:

1. A communication is received by the board from the Finance Department that an application for the issuance of Corporate Stock should be made promptly, or within a given time.

2. This is referred to the Committee on Buildings, which notifies the City Superintendent to submit his recommendations as to new buildings for the ensuing year.

3. Just what stages this passes through in the City Superintendent's office, or Board of Superintendents, we cannot say; but, finally, a copy of the schedule, as adopted by the Board of Superintendents, is transmitted by the City Superintendent to the Committee on Buildings. These recommendations cover many items, giving location, size, and reasons for desiring either a new building, or an addition to a present building, at any particular locality.

4. Copies are made (the present one contains about 60 pages), and sent to each of the members of the Committee on Buildings.

5. After consideration as to the order of importance, hearing the City Superintendent and others interested,

as may be deemed necessary, the list is adopted tentatively, and referred to the Superintendent of School Buildings.

6. The Superintendent of School Buildings fixes the approximate cost for each item, exclusive of sites. The first step is to examine and tabulate the list, making such readjustment of the number of class-room units recommended for each particular item as may be necessary to obtain the desired economies in construction. Thus a 49 class-room unit building would be fixed at 51; a 32 as a 36; and a 24 as a 26, for the reason that the lesser number of rooms, owing to the lack of economy in planning, would cost as much as the greater number given.

This is the result of the Bureau of Buildings having worked out several economical types which have become standardized. Thus a 36 class-room unit is economical in every way, since it provides a 10 class-room unit floor plan, with toilets, teachers' rooms, and stairways for the 2d, 3d, and 4th floors, while on the 1st floor there are 6 class rooms, the space of one being taken up by the front entrance, with a principal's, assistant principal's, or teachers' room at either side. Three class rooms are taken up by the assembly room, which projects under the building to that extent. There is no waste space at any point.

7. Examination is then made of the cost of previous work of the same type. In doing this there is considered the average low bid, it being necessary occasionally to eliminate one bid, which, because of its being so very much in excess of the next highest bid, would seem to indicate carelessness, or that it was not a bid based upon a careful examination of the plans and specifications.

8. Examination is made of the conditions surround-

ing the construction of additions to present buildings, as they often present problems exceeding in difficulty those of a new job. Local conditions are reported upon by the deputy superintendents, and such other information is obtained by the Superintendent of Buildings, within the limited time at his disposal, as may seem necessary to enable him to form definite ideas of what can be done and the cost thereof.

The class-room unit cost is fixed for the several standard types for general construction, sanitary work, heating and ventilating, electric fixture and furniture, the chiefs of the three last-named divisions being consulted as to special costs.

9. Estimates are then made, and the total cost of each item for each building is divided into two or three columns, as, for instance, Corporate Stock required to be authorized during 1911. Estimated issue of Corporate Stock, as per column 2, required for the following years: To July 1, 1912; to July 1, 1913; to July 1, 1914, etc. These estimates are then tabulated and presented to the Committee on Buildings, which afterward,

10. Upon approval, either presents them to the Board of Education for reference to the Committee on Finance, or forwards them direct to said Committee, whichever may seem desirable in point of time.

11. The Auditor, acting under the direction of the Committee on Finance, checks up the schedule and adds to it a statement of Corporate Stock authorized or released, etc., etc.; gives the code number, title of improvement, borough, school, amount of Corporate Stock authorized, etc.; Corporate Stock issued; estimated issues of Corporate Stock for various years; complement disbursements and balances of the excess of issues over authorization, etc.

12. Upon consideration and approval the whole is printed in the form of a report for presentation to the

Board of Education (see Document 3, Department of Education, 1911).

13. Upon consideration and approval, or adoption, it is forwarded to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

14. Then it is referred to the Comptroller, where it is taken up through his Bureau of Investigation and Statistics.

15. Conferences are held between representatives of that department and the President of the Board of Education, the chairman and members of the Committee on Buildings, the Committee on Sites, and the City Superintendent. When finally agreed upon it is presented to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

16. After consideration and adoption it is forwarded to the Board of Aldermen.

17. After hearings by the Finance Committee of that board, it is finally reported back, and, after consideration and approval, it is forwarded to the Mayor.

The lapse of time from the first step taken in preparing the Corporate Stock Budget last year until notice was received of its approval by the Mayor was from February to October 9.

We have not had time to examine the carefulness with which this routine is carried out or the satisfactoriness of the results obtained. This might well be the subject of a special investigation which should be made at the time when the estimates are presented.

CHAPTER XII

THE OFFICES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

THE Board of Education has not enough clerical help. Its office staff is inadequate. Men and women must work overtime, and, even with that, very important work which is greatly needed by the board and its officers cannot be kept up to date. The minutes of some of the committees are not typewritten for some months back. No index has as yet been prepared for the minutes of the board or of its committees for 1911. These things are not done because no one has been free to do them, and the staff is not a leisurely staff, but an overworked one.

The assistant secretary of the board reports that practically no salaries for additional clerks have been allowed for five years. The record of office employees allowed for three years is as follows:

	1910	1911	1912
Office of the Secretary	28	28	28
Office of the Auditor	54	55	60
Office of the City Superintendent	61	61	61
Offices of the District Superintendents	24	24	24
The Bureau of Supplies	128	130	130
The Bureau of Buildings	40	41	41
The Office of Superintendent of Janitors	6	6	6
Office of the Bureau of Lectures	8	8	8
Totals	349	353	358

But, though the clerical staff has not been enlarged, the volume of school business has increased mightily during this period. The new methods of doing business with the Finance Department of the city have entailed a heavy burden

of clerical labor upon the offices of the board. Almost daily requests have been made during the past year for statistical information for special purposes, the preparation of which would require the services of a special staff of considerable size, working at nothing else for some months. A sample of these extraordinary demands which the board is called upon to meet is a letter from the Comptroller of the city, under date of April 8, 1912, as follows:

“I request that you furnish me for use of the Corporate Stock Budget Committee with statistics showing by districts, schools, and grades, the number of pupils on part time in the elementary day schools of the city as per the monthly reports of the principals for March, 1912.”

Objection is not made to furnishing such statistical information, but to being required to do a greatly increased volume of work with a force quite inadequate for its regular duties.

The offices of the Board of Education have become, in large part, a place for supplying information to other municipal departments.

SPECIAL DIFFICULTIES

The Board of Estimate and Apportionment fixes the salary schedule of each of the different offices, and does not allow the Board of Education to rearrange its own salaries without its consent, or to employ more than the specified number of clerks even to meet the emergency demands which it, itself, makes upon the educational department. From this condition another difficulty arises of an even more serious sort. The salaries in the offices of the Board of Education are low. Its clerks are well trained in its service. Promotions come infrequently. In other departments the opportunity is better. Because of these facts the offices of the board cannot retain their

Name	Title	Transfers Bureau	Salary	Date	Department Transferred to
Jacob J. Balmuth	Clerk	Audit	\$300	Oct. 25, 11	Water Supply
Alex. J. Brezin, Jr.	Clerk	Supplies	600	Mar. 6, 11	Water Supply
James J. Collins	Clerk	Buildings	600	June 12, 11	Water Supply
Thomas W. Crowe	Clerk	Janitors	900	Nov. 9, 10	Law
Annette Cullinan	S. & T.	Buildings	600	Aug. 21, 11	Bridges
Anna G. Dufy	Typewriting and copyist				
Morris E. DeNat	Clerk	City Supt. Supplies	750	Nov. 22, 11	Prest. Bor. Queens
Julia V. Flynn	S. & T.	Dist. Supt. Office	300	Dec. 1, 10	Tenement House
Louis Goldstein	Clerk	Buildings	600	Feb. 5, 12	Bridges
Charles Herbst	Cleaner	Supplies	300	Jan. 15, 12	Permanent Census
			600	Dec. 5, 10	Prest. Borough of The Bronx
Michael Hertzoff	Clerk	Buildings	300	Oct. 1, 11	Law
John F. Higgins	Clerk	Audit	600	Feb. 5, 12	Water Supply
Jos. E. Jefferson	Clerk	Supplies	600	Mar. 6, 11	Water Supply
Henry E. Kelly	Clerk	Supplies	300	Feb. 5, 12	Water Supply
Harry Krett	Clerk	Secretary	420	June 11, 10	Permanent Census
Ernest G. Landre	Clerk	Buildings	600	June 1, 11	Water Supply
Francis J. Lee	Clerk	Buildings	600	May 21, 10	Water Supply
Irene C. Lynch	Typewriting and copyist				
Nicholas Marty	Clerk	Buildings	600	July 11, 11	Buildings, Bronx
Laurence A. McNally	Clerk	Buildings	1200	June 1, 11	Buildings, Man.
Jos. I. Norris	Clerk	Buildings	900	June 1, 11	Public Works
Wm. Rampmaier	Clerk	Audit	300	Feb. 28, 11	Fire
Rufus J. Suits	Clerk	Lectures	600	Jan. 9, 11	Water Supply
Matilda A. Weyman	Clerk	Lectures	1950	Nov. 1, 10	Permanent Census
I. Bennett Zinn	S. & T.	Lectures	1050	Mar. 7, 10	Permanent Census
			1200	Apr. 10, 11	Bridges

NOTE: Transfers in 1912 are given in Appendix C.

RESIGNATIONS

Name	Title	Bureau	Salary	Date
Thomas Armstrong . .	Clerk	Supplies	\$540	Sept. 15, 11
Helen M. Bannigan . .	Clerk	City Supt.	1,200	Oct. 31, 10
Alice M. Clark . . .	S. & T.	Libraries	1,050	Aug. 1, 10
Wm. H. Cushing . . .	Clerk	Supplies	300	April 22, 11
C. Victorine DeBuck .	Clerk	Supplies	900	Feb. 1, 11
Edward T. Diviny . .	Clerk	Supplies	420	Aug. 21, 11
Ona M. Finnerty . . .	S. & T.	Buildings	600	Feb. 7, 10
Mae M. Gaffney . . .	Typewriting ¹	Buildings	600	Oct. 1, 10
Benjamin Gassman . .	Clerk	Supplies	300	Jan. 24, 11
Joseph V. Glynn . . .	Clerk	Supplies	300	May 31, 11
John Guiry	Clerk	Supplies	420	Nov. 3, 10
Harry N. Hall	Inspector of Fuel	Supplies	1,300	Feb. 28, 10
Theodore Heilbron . .	Auto-truck ²	Supplies	1,500	Aug. 1, 10
Mary A. Horton	Telephone Op.	Secretary	750	Aug. 31, 10
Louis Jagendorf . . .	Clerk	Buildings	540	Aug. 21, 11
Julia E. King	Librarian	Lectures	900	Aug. 8, 10
Rose Lebram	S. & T.	Dist. Supt.	600	Sept. 30, 10
Hattie Mayers	S. & T.	City Supt.	1,200	July 18, 10
Henry McArdle	Clerk	Buildings	300	May 14, 10
Guilbert McCarthy . .	Clerk	Supplies	300	Oct. 31, 11
William P. Mee	Clerk	Supplies	300	May 16, 11
Mary M. Mullen	Clerk	Secretary	750	Aug. 31, 11
Joseph Morrow, Jr. .	Clerk	Supplies	300	Nov. 13, 11
Seconda H. Porcella . .	Typewriting ³	Buildings	750	Oct. 1, 10
Harry Posner	Clerk	Secretary	750	Oct. 31, 10
John A. Reagan	S. & T.	Supplies	1,050	Dec. 13, 11
John B. Robinson . . .	Deputy Supt. ⁴	Buildings	4,500	Sept. 10, 10
Eleanor Ryan	S. & T.	City Supt.	1,650	Oct. 31, 10
Milton C. Schwartz . .	Clerk	Buildings	300	Oct. 1, 11
Margaret A. Sheeran .	Telephone Op.	Secretary	600	Sept. 15, 10
William Strauss	Clerk	City Supt.	300	Sept. 7, 10
Mary P. Tiernan	S. & T.	Buildings	1,350	Aug. 31, 11
Mona C. Waldron . . .	S. & T.	Dist. Supt.	750	Sept. 30, 10
Fred C. Young	Clerk	Buildings	300	May 24, 11

¹ Typewriting Copyist.

² Auto-truck Engineman & Mechanic.

³ Typewriting and Copyist.

⁴ Deputy Supt. of Buildings.

NOTE: Transfers in 1912 are given in Appendix D.

clerks; instead, they have become a training school for private offices, and for other departments of the city's service. Lists of transfers and resignations from the staff of the Board of Education in recent months are given on pp. 150-151 and appendices C and D.

Such a wholesale depleting of its staff is bound seriously to cripple its work; but, as long as it has practically no control over its salary schedules, there is nothing for it to do but make the most it can of the services of the new clerks who must be broken into the work of the old ones whom it cannot arrange to keep. The salaries of each grade are fixed by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, and the Board of Aldermen; and the number of positions in each grade is fixed. The unassigned balances of each bureau are too insignificant to provide emergency help. No transfers can be made from one grade to another without the consent and approval of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. This takes away all flexibility and possibility of adjustment from the Board of Education. It also takes away all possibility of rewarding merit for efficiency, save as places of a higher grade become vacant. It leads to an uneconomical cramping of the system. If a clerk at \$750 falls ill and cannot return to work for a month or more, it is perhaps possible to fill her place temporarily with one who is unfamiliar with her routine at \$600 per year; but, before this can be done, application must be made to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to modify the salary schedule. This consumes time, and the salary is not available until it is readjusted. When the regular incumbent returns, it must be readjusted back again by the same tedious process. Moreover, no one is assured of the continuance of his salary at its present rate, for a committee on the standardization of salaries in city offices has been at work upon this subject for some time.

The fixing of salaries in the offices of the Board of Education by the Board of Aldermen, on the recommen-

dation of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, has been rather an expensive matter for the tax-payers of the city. In 1904 the Board of Education requested the Board of Aldermen to fix the salaries of certain persons at a higher rate than others in the same branch of service were receiving. They were fixed as salaries of positions in such a way as unwittingly to increase the salaries of all incumbents occupying similar positions in the service. The interested parties did not discover their advantage at once, but nearly seven years afterwards suits were brought to recover the accrued difference between the rate at which they had been paid and the higher rate so fixed; and, no legal defense against their claims being possible, the Corporation Counsel recommended that their claim for arrears be paid. The office of the Corporation Counsel reports that these valid claims aggregate in all about \$100,000.

A curious sequel to this situation is furnished by the following report from the Auditor of the Board of Education, concerning the official responsibility for the payment of these claims. The report bears date of April 26, 1911:

“ . . . An issue of bonds was requested to pay certain judgments against the Board of Education, due to the fact that this department was required to conform to Sec. 56 of the charter, and thereby required to go to the Board of Aldermen to fix the salaries of two persons and the effect of their action was to increase and fix the salaries of all other incumbents of similar positions who were receiving less than \$40 per week. Based on this requirement, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the Board of Aldermen created certain liabilities which were never contemplated. This department does not feel responsible, for the intention, as plainly shown in the original resolution, was to increase the salaries of two persons. When the issue of bonds was requested through the Board of Aldermen

to pay these judgments attention was called by that body to the fact that Sec. 188, subdivision 7, of the charter provides for payment of judgments by the Comptroller by Special Revenue Bonds to be issued by him; acting on this information, and realizing the separate identity of the Board of Education, I was deputed to go to the appropriate bureau in that department, namely, the Bureau of Law and Adjustment. I saw its chief, Mr. Hallock. After presenting the facts, and consulting with him regarding them, Mr. Hallock intimated that the funds over which he had control were applicable, in his judgment, only to the payment of claims against the corporation, and not to the payment of claims against the Board of Education."

It is evident that the present method of providing clerical service for the Board of Education is costly and cumbersome; that it prevents the board from controlling its own business or building up a permanent staff. It ought to be changed. Section 56 of the charter should be revised to give the Board of Education authority to fix the salaries of its own staff. That will take time, but, meanwhile, its appropriations for salary purposes should come to it in bulk and the matter of determining the number of persons in each grade, if salaries are fixed by position only, and not by person, as, indeed, the law seems to demand, should be left to it. The matter of transferring its employees from one grade to another should be entirely in the hands of the educational authorities. More money should be provided for salaries in the several offices of the board, and the amount of extraneous work that is put upon them should be cut down to reasonable limits.

CHAPTER XIII

THE ACQUIRING OF SITES

SECTION 1071 of the charter directs the Board of Education to "make such provision by its by-laws as will secure prompt and efficient service for the selection and acquisition of sites." The method by which such lands as have been selected are to be acquired is outlined in Section 1436 of the charter. The Board of Education must select all school sites; the Board of Estimate and Apportionment conducts all negotiations as to price and purchase of them. This is the method which has been followed since 1902. Prior to that time the Board of Education was responsible for the selection and purchasing of sites for school purposes.

ITS DUTY

The by-laws of the Board of Education charge its Committee on Sites with three duties: To consider every recommendation made by any local school board, or by the Committee on High Schools and Training Schools, with regard to sites for school buildings or additions thereto; to select and recommend to the board the acquisition of all sites that may be required for school purposes; and to report to the board in January and July of each year the condition of all matters relating to sites approved by the board which are pending and not completed; it shall also report to the Committee on Finance in July of each year an estimate of the amount required for the purchase and acquisition of sites during the next calendar year.

These by-laws do not put the responsibility for determining the need of additional ground for school buildings where it belongs. It is the superintendents in their operation of the educational work of the schools who first become aware of the necessity for enlargement of the school plant. The local school board may be, or may not be, sensitive to these needs; but the reports which come to the superintendents of instruction as to the size of classes, as to the number on part time, and the distances which children must travel in order to reach a school, keep them officially informed on this subject. The coöperation of the local school board is valuable, but a better systematizing of functions would place this duty upon the superintendents. In effect it is placed there now, but the superintendents are not in as close or as constant touch with this committee as they should be; and the committee itself is not as much concerned in working out a program for the necessary enlargement of the work of the entire department through a period of months, as it is in filling in here and there, as the need of this or that local school board or section becomes acute. That the plan for enlargement should be worked out from year to year as a whole, and not in a scrappy or piecemeal fashion, needs no argument. This cannot be done until the reports of district superintendents are carefully digested and unified by the superintendents, and presented to the Committee on Sites as the basis for its work.

This committee should be forehanded in making its plans for the enlargement of the system. It is not sufficient for it to ask the City Superintendent for a statement of the needs of the department for the next year at budget time. This is a fault due, in part, to insufficient control of funds. When needs cannot be met until they have become too acute to be postponed any longer, there is little occasion for figuring out beforehand just how long it will be before action of a preventive sort is inevitable. New York City has been planning its school enlargements on the theory that it is

better to take no thought for the morrow. Buildings which the Board of Education should have been allowed money to build months, even years, ago, are only now under way.

The necessities of the situation are more keenly felt at the operating end than they are at the fiscal end of the system. Former committees, desiring to keep ahead of the growth of population, selected school sites a bit ahead of immediate demands for them. They put them into stock, as it were, locating them where it seemed that they would be needed, and enabling the city to purchase them at a lower figure than they could be had for when the locality was crowded with people, as it promised to be shortly. In anticipating future needs they sometimes made mistakes, and school funds were tied up which could have been used to advantage in other quarters. It is the policy of the present committee to select no sites save such as are needed for immediate construction of buildings. This plan is not without drawbacks, but it is the only one that the present condition of funds will allow.

It would seem that the process of selecting a site has not until recently been altogether a matter of knowledge, but rather a hit-or-miss affair. The people of a locality decided that a school was needed in their neighborhood and brought the matter to the attention of the committee. It asked the City Superintendent for a report and, if he approved their request, the committee appointed a subcommittee of its members, who looked the ground over and used their judgment in fixing upon a spot for the school. Their report was submitted, and the Board of Education transmitted their selection to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, with the recommendation that the site selected be purchased. At this point the question of cost began to receive attention. The Board of Estimate found that a different tract of land in the same section could be had for a smaller price. It thereupon recommended that the Board of Education reconsider its former action and select the site which it recommended for selection. This

process is a long one. The securing of ground for a certain school in the Borough of Queens was begun on December 6, 1906, and is not completed yet. Another site in the same borough, selected on June 9, 1909, is not yet acquired. The whole process as now organized normally requires from six months to two years. In almost nine cases out of ten the Board of Estimate and Apportionment requests the Board of Education to substitute for the site which it has selected another one which the Board of Estimate and Apportionment recommends to it. Cost is such a large element that sites are practically selected twice. This involves a great waste of time, and forces the question whether the selection of a definite site by the Board of Education is a necessary step in the process, or merely one which requires much labor and much time to be spent in vain. Would it not be a better arrangement for the Board of Education to determine the general locality in which a new school is needed, and leave to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment the whole matter of locating the school to best advantage in that locality? The Board of Education would then select the locality which needs a school, and the Board of Estimate and Apportionment would select and purchase the site for it. The answer is no. Such a plan will not work. School sites must be determined by educational consideration, not by the cheapness of the lots which it is proposed to acquire. The sole purpose in getting them is to provide school accommodations where they are needed, and when they are needed. The present method does not provide them where they are needed nor always when they are needed.

A PROPOSED SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF THE NEED FOR SITES

In order to determine where new schools are most needed, and just where they should be located to be most accessible to the children who will use them, the Board of Education, on January 10, 1912, adopted a recommendation of its

Committee on Sites providing for a scientific method of locating them. The committee proposes to develop a system for securing complete information concerning the population of the city in relation to present educational provision and school needs, and so to devise ways and means for eliminating errors of judgment in the faulty choice of sites and in the making of inadequate or excessive provision for school requirements. It proposes to study the needs of the system as a whole, and to work out a constantly available and constantly perfecting program for enlargement of the school plant. Its work, as it sees it, falls into three parts: A general study of the trend of population and locations of existing school buildings, to correct and avoid the errors of the past, and to provide a continuous program of school development. A particular part of this program is to be selected each year for presentation in the annual bond budget, supported by such statistics as will demonstrate clearly its claim for immediate attention. A third application of scientific method to this subject will consist in a careful school survey of the locality in which a site is to be acquired and a building built, which shall determine accurately just what territory it must serve; how far the capacity of buildings already in operation extends; where the center of the school population which is to be served is; what hindrances from inaccessibility, danger from street traffic, noise, and the general character of the community impose obstacles to the location of a school house in a given block and require it to be placed in another, etc., etc.

It is proposed to accomplish this important work under the direction of the Auditor of the Board of Education, and by means of the statistical division under his charge. An issue of Special Revenue Bonds of \$10,000 has been applied for to provide the necessary equipment and material, and the special service required for this study of population, and the conditions incidental and necessary to the locating of school premises. The resolution of the board leaves the impression that a special study is to be made now to provide

information which will assist in making the next budget and be available for some months to come, and when this is once done the work will, perhaps, be discontinued. The agency should, however, be a permanent one, and the study of population in relation to school needs should go on all the time with the assistance of the Superintendent and the local school boards, collecting and furnishing information as to the ever varying movement of population in the city; and, with the help of the Permanent Census Board, preparing detailed surveys of localities for the proper location of schools. In no other way can the Board of Education know its own needs thoroughly; and, when it once knows them in this scientific fashion, it is safe to assume that educational requirements, rather than the price of lots, will be allowed to determine the location of school premises.

THE STATEMENT OF NEEDS FOR FOUR YEARS

In order to arrive at as nearly exact information as possible with regard to the probable margin of borrowing power of the City of New York during the period of subway construction, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, on November 23, 1910, requested the several departments of the city to submit a statement of their needs for corporate stock "during the year beginning July 1, 1911, and as far as possible for the subsequent years to and including the year 1915, showing the amounts that will be required for expenditures during the year 1911, in pursuance of authorizations now existing, and showing separately the additional amounts that will be required or requested in each annually recurring Corporate Stock Budget for the years stated, all of such information to be submitted in a manner and form prescribed by the Comptroller." Since it is manifestly impossible to foresee the needs of the school department of New York City in detail for four years, the estimates which were furnished were merely rough approximations, and by no means final statements of the annual

needs of the board. The Committee on Sites further found it inadvisable to give the location of the sites needed prior to their actual selection by the Board of Education for the reason that information of this character invariably leads to rises in price of lands from which selections must be made. The Board of Education estimated its needs, therefore, in lump sums: \$1,000,000 for 1911, and the same amount for 1912; and \$500,000 each year for 1913, 14, and 15.

THE SITUATION IN REGARD TO SITES

On February 6, 1911, the Committee on Sites submitted the following statement to the Board of Education:

At the time of the annual organization of the Board of Education in February, 1910, the situation as respects sites was as follows:

Sites for new buildings, additions, etc., in process of acquisition 8

Sites for new buildings, additions, etc., selected by the Board of Education and awaiting action by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.... 31

Sites for new buildings, additions, etc., approved by the Committee on Sites and placed in the hands of the Comptroller for the purpose of enabling him to make arrangements for the acquisition thereof prior to formal action by the Board of Education 22

Sites for new buildings, additions, etc., on the committee's approved list, awaiting financial ability 32

Your committee, having decided upon the policy of advocating the acquisition only of those sites required for immediate use to meet existing requirements, investigated the necessity of each of the above-mentioned sites, with a view to eliminating from consideration all those intended for future growth, etc. This investiga-

tion showed the necessity for certain sites which had been carried on the committee's list, in some cases, for years had ceased to exist because of other relief furnished; in some cases the necessity for the sites was problematical and dependent upon future growth, and there could be no accurate method of determining when the sites would be actually required for school use; in many cases it was apparent that the sites would soon be needed, but the necessity was not immediate. Your committee obtained reports on all these sites from the board of superintendents and the local school boards, and, after consideration of all the facts adduced, decided to abandon all except those sites actually required to relieve schools with pupils on part time, or where part time was imminent. The following shows the result:

Sites for new buildings acquired since February 1, 1910	5
Sites authorized and in process of acquisition (one to complete a site partly acquired by purchase, and one an interior lot to which it was necessary to remove an old school building pending the erection of a new building)	2
Sites for new buildings and additions, etc., selected by the Board of Education and awaiting action by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment..	17
Site for a new building approved by the Committee on Sites and awaiting negotiations by the Comptroller before presentation to the Board of Education	1

In addition to the foregoing the Board of Education, on December 14, 1910, surrendered to the commissioners of the Sinking Fund four sites previously acquired for school purposes, the necessity for the same having ceased to exist through enlarged conditions.

The committee further reports that there are now available 28 sites for new buildings (including the site acquired for the Central Supply Depository), and 12

sites for additions, playgrounds, etc. All of these sites are required for present use, or will be required in the very near future, and funds for the improvements of nearly all of them are included in the estimate of the Committee on Buildings respecting Corporate Stock requirements for the years 1911 and 1912.

On January 10, 1912, the Board of Education reported that it had acquired during 1911 one site for school purposes in the Borough of Manhattan, and that action was pending before the Board of Estimate and Apportionment upon the matter of authorizing the acquisition of another which had been selected by it on November 22, 1911. In the Bronx one site and part of another have been acquired, the purchase of three has been authorized, and action is pending upon three which have been selected by the board on May 11, 1910, December 13, 1911, and September 13, 1911. In the Borough of Brooklyn six have been acquired. One and a part of two others have been authorized; one selected on March 9, 1910, is still pending; and the request of the board that one other be acquired has been filed by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for the reason that no funds were provided for it in the Corporate Stock Budget. In the Borough of Queens three have been acquired and action is pending upon three selected on June 9, 1909, May 11, 1910, and May 10, 1911. In the Borough of Richmond the purchase of one site has been authorized.

Is the service prompt and efficient in the matter of selecting and acquiring school sites? It is neither prompt nor efficient. Prompt and satisfactory it cannot be as long as it is out of the control of the Board of Education; and efficient it cannot be until the Board of Education puts into operation the scientific methods which are planned for, determining the needs of enlargement for the system as a whole, and makes the most careful surveys as to the school requirements of a locality before it locates a school site in it, using all the knowledge which is available in its several

offices for the purpose. And, further, the service cannot be satisfactory until there are sufficient funds at the disposal of the Board of Education to enable it to anticipate its necessities before they become so pressing as to require thousands of children to attend part time classes.

CHAPTER XIV

THE CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS

THE DUTIES OF THE BUILDING COMMITTEE

THE Committee on Buildings is composed of nine members of the board and has charge of all matters relating to the erection, enlargement, alteration, and repairing of all school buildings and school premises, the leasing of premises or buildings for the purposes of the Department of Education, the fitting up and equipping thereof with all necessary sanitary, electric, heating, and ventilating work, furniture, and pianos. Subject to financial ability and the approval of the board, it determines the amount to be expended therefor. It directs the activities of the Bureau of Buildings. Its executive officer and the head of the bureau is the Superintendent of School Buildings. Its procedure in the matter of leasing premises for school purposes has already been detailed. The steps in the process of constructing buildings after Corporate Stock has been appropriated for the purpose are as follows:

THE PROCESS BY WHICH BUILDINGS ARE PLANNED

After consideration and approval of the Corporate Stock Budget for Buildings by the Mayor, notice of the fund allowed is sent to the Board of Education. Owing to the fact that, after requests for Corporate Stock have gone through all of the steps roughly outlined in the making of estimates, and then been vetoed by previous mayors, it is not considered safe to proceed with the preparation of

plans and specifications until notice of the Mayor's approval has been received.

1. When approved the building budget is referred to the Committee on Buildings.

2. It is then referred to the Superintendent of School Buildings to proceed with the work.

3. The Superintendent of School Buildings takes up the list in the order given, and, after authority is given to prepare plans and specifications, or advertise for bids, proceeds to obtain surveys.

4. He obtains recommendations from the City Superintendent for each building in order, as to apportionment of rooms for boys and girls; grades, number of class rooms, kindergartens, anæmic classes, assembly rooms, roof playgrounds, and such other features as he may desire to recommend, which are submitted to the Committee on Buildings for approval.

5. Examination is made of the site, and the question of exposure, location, grades, encroachments, and many other similar questions are determined.

6. He then directs the chief of the draughting division to proceed on the lines indicated.

7. He determines the type of the building and the design. The Board of Education calls on the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund to have the site cleared of all buildings and encumbrances, and to turn the property over to the Board of Education on a given date.

8. He passes upon sketches and, when they are satisfactory, he forwards them to the Art Commission for preliminary approval.

9. The plans and specifications are then developed, and the various sets are filed with

10. The Committee on Buildings,

11. The Board of Education,

12. The Art Commission for final approval,

13. The Borough Building Department,

14. The Highway Department,

15. The Department of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity,

16. The Finance Department, which requires copies of the printed specifications and all plans and details complete.

After consideration by the engineers of that department, it is presented

17. To the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for approval.

Upon receipt of notice of this

18. Specifications and form of advertisement are sent for approval to the Corporation Counsel.

19. Upon receipt, the approval is filed with the supervisor of the *City Record*.

20. An advertisement for bids appears in the *City Record* for ten days.

21. At the expiration of this period bids are opened by the Superintendent of School Buildings.

Many steps must be taken in the preparation of plans and specifications which are not herein scheduled; but, from the beginning of item 1 to the date of letting the contract, it is not so much the number of steps which hinder and delay action, although these are far too numerous, as it is the element of human equation which enters with each reference of plans to another official body for approval.

THE NUMBER OF PLANS PREPARED DURING 12 MONTHS

In answer to our question as to number and size of school buildings, together with the contract or estimated cost thereof for which the plans were prepared in the last twelve months, the list on the following page was submitted.

This means that the above schedule, or its equivalent, covers a year's work for the force of architectural draughtsmen at present employed on Corporate Stock work. Almost desperate efforts have been made to obtain an increase in their number, but without success.

Item	School	Borough	Contract or Estimated Cost
1	P. S. 61	Manhattan	\$316,000
1	Bushwick High School	Brooklyn	420,000
1	Thomas Hunter Hall (Exc.)	Manhattan	500,000
1	Thomas Hunter Hall (Bldg.)	Manhattan	
1	P. S. 20 (Excavation)	The Bronx	77,000
1	P. S. 20 (Bldg. Addn.)	The Bronx	
1	P. S. 92	Queens	182,000
1	P. S. 43, Addition	The Bronx	98,500
1	P. S. 39, Addition	The Bronx	222,000
1	P. S. 45, Addition	The Bronx	294,000
1	P. S. 78, Addition	Manhattan	192,000
1	P. S. 132, Addition	Manhattan	174,000
1	Training Quarters	Brooklyn	67,045
1	P. S. 173	Brooklyn	274,000
2	P. S. 174	Brooklyn	274,000
13	P. S. 72, Addition	Manhattan	35,000
7	P. S. 115 (Excavation)	Manhattan	87,000
4	P. S. 50 (Excavation)	The Bronx	48,143
5	P. S. 28	Brooklyn	175,000 ²
3	P. S. 175	Brooklyn	274,000 ²
4	P. S. 50 (Building)	The Bronx	246,000 ²
1	Bay Ridge High School	Brooklyn	400,000 ²
27	P. S. 97 (Portables)	Brooklyn	3,000 ¹
			\$4,358,688

¹ Authorization prior to Corporate Stock Budget of 1911.

² Completed as far as advance work is concerned. These last are here given Item numbers, being the order in which they appeared on the list as adopted.

STEPS IN THE LETTING OF CONTRACTS

22. Bids are now opened by the Superintendent of School Buildings. This is done in accordance with subdivision 1, section 30, of the by-laws, the chairman of the Committee on Buildings almost invariably being present, so that, after consideration of the lowest bid and comparison with the estimated cost, award can be made at once on behalf of the

Committee on Buildings, which later confirms his action. This prompt award is made to head off the withdrawal of bids, which formerly, at times, caused much confusion and delay.

23. The estimated cost is made in the draughting division in great detail. It is marked on the specifications, approved by the chief of the draughting division, and filed with the printing clerk before the plans and specifications are sent to the Finance Department for approval. This approval is quite a formidable thing, consisting, as it does, of reports and recitals by the assistant engineers of the Finance Department, and approving of the estimated cost. The words "estimated" or "approximate" being interpreted by the Finance Department to mean the sum fixed or less—but not a dollar more. This causes trouble and delay; if the lowest bid exceeds the estimated cost, although the funds are in hand, yet the Board of Education must explain the matter and ask for a reconsideration and approval.

The Superintendent of School Buildings has nothing further to do with the awards of bids from the time of reporting the list of those received to the Committee on Buildings up to the date he receives notice from the secretary of the approval of the contract by the Comptroller.

The various steps in that process are recorded in a book kept in the secretary's office, which is ruled for the following information: Acc't, contractor, school, borough, work, amount of contract awarded, bid transmitted to Comptroller, sureties approved by Comptroller, sureties, notice of approval of sureties received, signed by chairman, signed by contractor, bond attached, sent to Auditor, returned by Auditor, sent to Comptroller, approved by Comptroller, notice received from Comptroller, sent to contractor, remarks.

THE INSPECTION OF WORK UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Upon receipt of notice from the secretary of approval by the Comptroller notice is sent to the deputy superin-

tendents, who act under instructions contained in Deputy Superintendents' letter, as follows:

GENTLEMEN, — Permit me to draw your attention to paragraph (L) of the contract form under which we are now operating, which reads as follows:

“(L) The contractor will begin the work hereby agreed to be performed on such date as the superintendent shall notify him to begin. The time hereinafter fixed for the completion of the work shall begin to run on and from the date so notified. The place where the work is to be begun will either be stated in said notice or designated on the ground by the engineer or inspector. The commencement of the work by the contractor shall be deemed and taken to be a waiver of notice on his part.”

It is only exceptional cases where we experience any difficulty, inasmuch as contractors nearly always commence work prior to the approval of the contract, and thus waive notices as to time and place of beginning of work.

The only safe way, however, is to notify them to begin, designating the particular point where the work shall start, and then, if no progress is made, we are in a position to cancel the contract.

I am afraid that if we have a case where through lack of progress it is deemed desirable to cancel a contract, and it is done without notice having been given as to time and place of beginning, or work having been voluntarily started, all as provided for in paragraph (L) as above, the courts will hold the Board of Education for damages.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) C. B. J. SNYDER,

Superintendent of School Buildings.

This notice is given in accordance with the provisions of Clause (L) of the contract form.

The rights of the department as to inspection are particularly covered by specific clauses in the contract.

Clause B — Interpretation of words "Superintendent of School Buildings."

Clause C — Definition of "approved," "required," etc.

Clause D — The satisfaction of the Superintendent and the Committee on Buildings.

Clause J — Condemnation of work and materials.

Clause LL — Time of performance.

Clause N — Supervision of Superintendent of School Buildings.

Clause O — Superintendent of School Buildings to decide.

Clause P — Partial payments not acceptable.

Clause Q — Default of contractor — See certification of Superintendent as to unwarranted delay, and power of Superintendent to enter when safety and proper construction is endangered.

Clause W — Certificates.

Clause ZZ — Estoppel.

This is important, and must be read in relation to the Rules and Regulations, Building Bureau, Edition seven, April, 1911. These rules, based upon experience, have been prepared, from time to time, by the Superintendent of School Buildings.

The policy of the city is to assign an inspector to the work just as soon as there is anything requiring supervision. On new work this does not take place usually until the contractor is ready to put in footings. At times, however, it must be done earlier, as where there is underpinning of adjacent property to be done or an excavation which may endanger adjoining property or the streets.

Delivery of plans, specifications, and details are made to the deputy superintendents and to the inspectors.

Inspectors stationed on a building are men appointed from the civil service list of inspectors of masonry and carpentry; they have charge of all work except that of heating and ventilating, electric, sanitary, and furniture.

These last four branches, being particular trades of which a mason and carpenter would have no technical knowledge, owing to trade union limitations and jurisdiction, are covered by inspectors of the particular branch involved.

With several buildings under construction, there arises the necessity for knowing that the inspectors are at their posts of duty; that questions beyond their ability are promptly cared for; and that a reliable means is provided for the transmission of instructions from the deputy superintendents to the contractors and the inspectors. This is provided for by the appointment of general inspectors, who are a superior type of men and have greater responsibilities.

Inspectors are provided with special books for the making of daily reports. The original (A₁) is mailed to the main office; the yellow sheet (A₃) to the borough office; and the tissue sheet (A₂) is kept in the book for reference.

A daily-weekly mechanics form (B) is provided, so as to supply an accurate, systematic means of counting the men employed and reporting them in uniform order.

A progress sheet (C) is made up for each week, copy being retained at the building.

Reports of the general inspectors are provided for on form "A" at the building, and by form "D" at the office.

When exceptions are taken as to work or material, notice thereof is sent to contractor by the record clerk. These exceptions are entered in a record book, together with their final disposition.

Payments are made as the work progresses, the contractor using a regular blank form of application. These

are time stamped when received at the office and entered in a book kept for that purpose, giving the necessary data as to dates, name, amounts, to whom referred, and date sent back — approved or disapproved.

If approved, a voucher is issued by the Superintendent of School Buildings, and forwarded to the Auditor, who, after recording same, sends it to the Finance Department. Examination is also made by its engineers, payment passed, and warrant issued to the contractor for the amount of the payment.

Amendments to the contract are sometimes necessary, in which case a regular form is used, to which are attached all the papers and drawings relating thereto. Upon approval by the Committee on Buildings an amendment is signed and receives its serial number.

Upon final completion (and this means everything to the last screw), form F, covering the moneys due, is certified to by the deputy superintendent, general inspector (construction), general inspector of painting, engineer of iron and steel construction, and, at times, the chief of the sanitary division. It must also bear the certification of the record division that all exceptions have been removed. This must be accompanied by a report from the record division as to dates of contract, completion, and occupancy, time lost by contractor through no fault of his, overtime and reasons therefor for the contractor. This is checked up, but is seldom in accordance with the facts.

The Corporation Counsel's office is not at all sure that clause (M) of the contract will be sustained by the courts, unless the city can show no interference of any sort, not only for the Board of Education, but from any of the numerous other city departments, or that the delay has actually kept the school closed. In other words, some tangible damage.

It has, therefore, become necessary for the Committee on Buildings to view an application for an extension

of time from all sides, and, if the school has not been interfered with, or the contractor has been interfered with, to grant an extension of time.

Frequently contractors are called before the committee to explain delays, and, when the case is beyond remedy, the contract is annulled, as provided by clause (Q) of the contract.

This reads very simply, but, in all cases where such action becomes necessary, there are moneys owing to sub-contractors, material men, and sometimes for labor; and, while the law states that liens against contractors for the city can only be against the moneys due or to grow due, and not against the real property, yet, in

Borough	P. S.	C. R. Units	Sit- tings	Gen'l Con- struction Amt. of Contract	Award by Bldg. Com.	Award by Bd. of Ed.
Brooklyn . .	19	36	1,371	\$193,988	Mar. 21, 10	Mar. 23, 10
Brooklyn . .	165	39	1,501	219,447	Aug. 8, 10	Aug. 15, 10
Brooklyn . .	167	51	2,079	266,700	Apr. 4, 10	Apr. 13, 10
Manhattan .	95	60	2,537	353,300	July 5, 10	July 13, 10
The Bronx .	44	47	2,037	235,841	Dec. 20, 09	Dec. 22, 09
The Bronx .	46	51	1,909	276,600	June 8, 10	June 8, 10
Queens . . .	7	24	940	147,978	July 11, 10	July 13, 10
Queens . . .	58	24	1,118	183,000	Jan. 10, 10	Jan. 12, 10

P. S. 19, Brooklyn — Also included extensive alterations in old building,

P. S. 165, Brooklyn — Delayed through non-receipt of bids for a part of the ers from August 12, 1911, to February, 1912, and sheet-metal workers from months. Work completed with non-union men. Conditions such that City organization ready.

P. S. 167, Brooklyn — Was occupied in September, 1911, but lockout of temporary arrangements had to be made.

P. S. 95, Manhattan — Would have been ready November 1, 1911, except for

P. S. 46, The Bronx — First delay was in rock excavation covering the en-should have been added. Delays also for lockouts of marble workers and sheet-

These lockouts affected the entire city, but special appeal was made to the work was started, but with incompetent men, finally ending in the forming of

every case after completion by another contractor, suits for recovery of damages are brought by the sub-contractors, etc., of the first man, every effort being made to prove arbitrary and unwarranted action by the committee.

With all this and much more before it, the committee is forced to exert every effort to get the work ahead rather than cancel the contract, even to the point of treating with a committee of creditors.

If the inspector cannot handle the matter it goes to the next in authority, the general inspector; then to the Deputy Superintendent; the Superintendent; then to the Committee on Buildings and the Board of Education.

Date of Contract	Date of Approval	Date of Expiration	Ready	Occupied
May 9, 10	June 6, 10	June 3, 11	Sept. —, 11	Sept. 11, 11
Sept. 2, 10	Sept. 16, 10	Sept. 14, 11	Feb. 1, 12	Feb. 19, 12
May 9, 10	June 14, 10	June 12, 11	Sept. —, 11	Sept. 11, 11
July 29, 10	Aug. 12, 10	Jan. 8, 12	Jan. 8, 12	Jan. 10, 12
May 27, 10	June 13, 10	July 13, 11	July —, 11	Sept. 11, 11
June 30, 10	July 19, 10	July 17, 11	Apr. 1, 12	Apr. 8, 12
Aug. 6, 10	Aug. 12, 10	Sept. 13, 11	Sept. 11, 11	Sept. 11, 11
Apr. 13, 10	Apr. 27, 10	May 26, 11	June —, 11	Sept. 11, 11

which could not be concluded until July and August, 1911. heating work, readvertisement, reapproval, etc. Also lockout of marble work—November 4, 1911, to March, 1912. Actual delay for this cause about three Superintendent could not be notified far enough in advance to get his new

marble workers from August 12 held upstairs urinals and baths, for which

the lockout above referred to.

tire site, its extent being overlooked in fixing the time limit, to which 90 days metal workers, which hit this building very hard.

bosses to take the men back on the schools. After weeks of negotiations the new unions early this year.

BUILDINGS COMPLETED

In addition to all this routine there are so many contingent things, precedents, rulings, opinions, outside jurisdiction, etc., etc., that it is a marvel how it is possible ever to complete a building; but buildings are completed as the following schedule will show:

ORGANIZATION OF THE INSPECTING STAFF

A part of the Bureau of Buildings is the inspecting service. This has to do not only with examinations as to the necessity for repair work, the preparation of specifications and the supervision of the work performed thereunder, but also constant oversight of all properties used for the purposes of the Board of Education, which includes not only the public school buildings, but also the office buildings, leased premises, storehouses, athletic fields, playgrounds, ferryboats used for anæmic classes, and vacant sites.

The force is subdivided into five branches:

- (a) General Repairs.
- (b) Sanitary.
- (c) Furniture.
- (d) Heating and Ventilating.
- (e) Electricity.

Each division is made up of men who were mechanics in the various trades represented, passing to the grade of inspector through promotion examination held by the Civil Service Commission. The inspection districts include from two to four local school board districts, following the same boundaries whenever possible.

In the average number of buildings hereinafter given as being under the charge of the inspectors, no credit is given where there is more than one building on a site, while, as a matter of fact, there are numerous such instances, from Public Schools 37 and 51, Manhattan, each with its two

distinct buildings, to Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, with its seven separate structures. Neither is credit given for the playgrounds, ferryboats, and vacant sites. Further, no credit is given for the inspection of work on new schools and additions under erection in any inspection district to which a sanitary, furniture, heating, or electrical inspector may be assigned. Most of this work varies, is widely separated, and it would not, therefore, be economical to employ inspectors for this Corporate Stock work alone, owing to the time which would be lost in travel.

The apportionment of inspectors used in presentation of budget for 1912 is as follows:

Borough of Manhattan

Number of school premises — 228

General Repairs —

1 General inspector

1 Assistant

7 Inspectors, averaging 33 buildings each.

Sanitary —

1 Chief of Division, all boroughs

1 Assistant, assigned to Brooklyn

4 Inspectors, averaging 57 buildings each.

Furniture —

1 Chief of Division, all boroughs

4 Inspectors, averaging 57 buildings each.

Heating and Ventilating —

1 Chief of Division, all boroughs

1 Assistant chief, all boroughs, principally Corporate Stock work

4 Inspectors, averaging 57 buildings each.

1 Inspector to pipe covering, all boroughs

1 Inspector to galvanized duct work and crates, all boroughs.

178 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

Electrical —

- 1 Chief of Division, all boroughs
- 1 Assistant, assigned to Brooklyn
- 3 Inspectors, averaging 76 buildings each.
These receive some assistance from the mechanics employed.

Borough of the Bronx

Number of school premises — 68

General Repairs —

- 1 General inspector
- 3 Inspectors, averaging 23 buildings each.

Sanitary —

- 1 Inspector, 68 buildings.

Furniture —

- 1 Inspector, 68 buildings.

Heating and Ventilating —

- 2 Inspectors, 34 buildings each.

Electrical —

- 1 Inspector (covering also upper part of Manhattan).

Borough of Brooklyn

Number of school premises — 219

General Repairs —

- 1 General inspector
- 7 Inspectors, averaging 31 buildings each.

Sanitary —

- 1 Assistant Chief of Division
- 4 Inspectors, including one foreman plumber, averaging 55 buildings each.

Furniture —

Work is handled by the work shop force, together with some other assistance, and, not being satisfactory, will be changed at an early date to suit present conditions.

Heating and Ventilating—

4 Inspectors, averaging 55 buildings each.

Electrical—

1 Assistant Chief of Division

1 Inspector, together with the assistance of the work shop.

Borough of Queens

Number of school premises — 116

General Repairs—

1 General inspector

4 Inspectors, averaging 29 buildings each.

Sanitary—

2 Inspectors, averaging 58 buildings each.

Furniture—

1 Inspector, 116 buildings (also receives assistance from repair inspectors).

Heating and Ventilating—

2 Inspectors, averaging 58 buildings each.

Electrical—

1 Inspector, 116 buildings

2 Mechanics.

Borough of Richmond

Number of school premises — 44

General Repairs—

1 General inspector

2 Inspectors, averaging 22 buildings each.

Sanitary—

1 Inspector, 44 buildings.

Furniture—

1 Inspector, 44 buildings.

Heating and Ventilating—

1 Inspector, 44 buildings.

Electrical—

1 Inspector, 44 buildings (does most of his repair work).

The Finance Department of the city has expressed the opinion that this inspection force should be materially reduced. This resolves itself again into the question whether the School Department shall determine its own policy. Account must be taken of the increase of liability of the city as to accidents and more rapid deterioration of the property in the absence of prompt repairs, done under efficient supervision. There are seven repair inspectors in the Borough of Manhattan; each has about thirty-three buildings. A reduction of two men would leave but five to handle the repairs in that borough, each with forty-five buildings and the safety of some 55,000 pupils under his care. The sanitary, furniture, heating, and electrical men look after work in their lines of trade, only the repair men all else. All of these men are handled by administration diagrams. The Bureau of Buildings believes that an increase in all the branches is demanded rather than a decrease.

THE EFFECT OF REDUCED APPROPRIATIONS

Answering the question, "What effect upon your work has resulted from reductions which the fiscal authorities have made in the last two years?" the Superintendent of Buildings says:

"The net result is the postponement of about one-third of the work contemplated for each year. It operates to disorganize all estimates for the larger repairs. Thus, each inspector knows the limit to which he may include repairs for his district. He, therefore, naturally adjusts some of the items to cover a completed piece of work, such as the painting of the interior of a building, or putting on a new roof, or alterations in partitions so as to enlarge or otherwise change class rooms or playgrounds, etc., etc. When his budget is cut he must readjust his work, and this at once opens the door for departure from the original field notes.

"If the funds were granted on the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent basis of cost, as proposed by the Building Committee, everyone could be held to the lists of work originally prepared. If the Board of Estimate and Apportionment decides that this percentage is too great, then it should so instruct the Board of Education, stating what it will allow, so that the estimates could be made on that basis.

"What the effect of the postponement of repairs to a building may be is largely problematical, except that certain results are sure to follow defective roofs, leaders, water, stair, and gas work."

The estimate for an increase of the force is made only after careful consideration of the needs. One instance may be shown by the copy of a letter written to the chairman of the Committee on Buildings by the Superintendent, and by him sent, with a most earnest endorsement, to the Budget Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, relative to the employment of a sheet-metal worker, copy of which is as follows:

October 26, 1911.

HON. FRANK D. WILSEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Buildings,
Board of Education.*

DEAR SIR, — Our budget for 1912, Schedule No. 15, Building Bureau, division of repairs, salaries, provides for an "Inspector of Sheet-metal Work at \$30 per week," a new position.

I do not recall having directed special attention to the urgent necessity for the inclusion of this position in the final budget as fixed by the Budget Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

In the installation of heating and ventilating plants there is a large amount of sheet-metal duct work. The

fact that these ducts are to provide for the flow of a given amount of air per minute necessitates their being designed and built to specific dimensions and under certain rules as to changes of direction or size.

This requires a high order of skill on the part of the designing engineer, and also on the part of the inspector. This work is at present done by one of our best heating and ventilating inspectors, who is a technical graduate. This man's services, however, are needed for another purpose, as will be hereinafter explained, and it is to replace him that this inspector of sheet-metal work has been included in our budget.

You will recall, from my various reports and statements in committee, that we have been unable to do any work on the adjustment of dampers in the fresh-air supply of hundreds of class rooms, for the reason that the man we had who was engaged in the work was transferred to another department, and we could find no one to take his place. Hence, we are in receipt of a great many complaints.

The adjustment of the dampers to fresh air becomes necessary in order to insure an equal distribution of fresh-air supply, and thus overcome the tendency of an over supply in the branches which take off from the main ducts nearest the fan, thus reducing the supply of those further along.

You will also recall the fact that the heating and ventilating plants as we are installing them have been inspected and approved by Professor Woodbridge, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Professor Carpenter, dean of Mechanical Engineering at Cornell University.

Our practice as to design and installation is similar to that followed elsewhere for the same class of work.

Quite recently the data that have accumulated, through years of experiment, both here and abroad, relative to fresh-air supply for schools, hospitals, and other build-

ings have been questioned, particularly as to the relation of humidity to temperature and the contamination of air.

This was focalized by an address of Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick at the last annual convention of the American Institute of Heating and Ventilating Engineers, resulting in the appointing of a committee to consider the subject.

It is admitted that the heating engineers have brought the science of their profession to a point where they can heat a room of certain construction, exposure, and dimensions to a given temperature, at the same time maintaining a constant supply of a given amount of fresh air, and the standard of purity and of humidity, but they are not prepared to investigate how these conditions affect the efficiency of the pupils, this being a question for the medical profession to answer, on the assumption that a pupil does his best work when his body is in the best physical condition.

The Society named as its committee some of its members who are in Boston, and others in New York, one of them being myself.

The importance with which this work is regarded in Boston may be evidenced, perhaps, by the fact that was taken up by Dr. Arthur T. Cabot, Hon. President of the American School Hygiene Association, and Dr. Harrington, who has conducted a large amount of original research work along similar lines also by experts of the Boston Schoolhouse Commission.

In this city the matter was discussed yesterday afternoon at an informal conference consisting of Mr. C. F. A. Winslow, the bacteriologist; Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick, of the Department of Child Hygiene of the Sage Foundation; the American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers being represented by Mr. D. D. Kimball, Mr. Mason, M. B., and myself.

It was realized that the absence of original re-

liable data as affecting the efficiency of the pupils in the school would necessitate an enormous amount of research, which must also cover a considerable period of time, since none of the methods hitherto used in the calorimeter, or the tests of mental or physical fatigue or reaction, could be used upon a pupil and secure results which would be reliable, since none of the tests could be conducted without the child becoming aware of his being made a special object of an experiment, or the interruption of his regular course of school work.

In other words, observation must be made of a large number of children instead of the individual. Just how this is to be done is now being worked out by the committee, which will have a conference at an early date, but, in the meantime, our budget may be closed by the Budget Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, and, if this matter is not made clear so that the inspector of sheet-metal work is included, so as to release the man at present detailed to that work, we will be absolutely unable to take any part in this investigation, the scope and importance of which has been very faintly outlined by what I have herein written.

What I seek and expect to accomplish is the reduction of temperature, which means a saving of coal.

The cost of carrying on this research work, as far as we are concerned, will be very little more than a part of the salary of the inspector, a portion of whose time only will be required for adjustments and observations; but these, to be of any value, must be regular and accurate, and free from disturbances and interruptions, since they will extend over three or four months.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) C. G. J. SNYDER,

Superintendent of School Buildings.

COMMENTS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOL
BUILDINGS

The amount of money involved was very small compared with the great good that could have been accomplished.

One of the results is that the Special Committee on Heating and Ventilating is carrying on its investigation without the very necessary data which the allowance of the man, as explained in the letter, would have given.

The data cannot be obtained anywhere just at present, although both Boston and Chicago have committees working on the problem — Chicago for two years — which are not ready to report.

The question is the relation of temperature to humidity, or vice versa, so as to obtain the best physical and mental results with school children.

Another instance is shown in the failure to grant additional draughtsmen for the Corporate Stock Account who were included in our budget, although the Finance Department was in full possession of all data as to Corporate Stock Budget before the Board of Aldermen and the Mayor, and the further fact that our force was not much more than half what it was when we were busy in 1907-1908.

The resolution failed, however, of passage in the Board of Aldermen, due, according to the statements made by some of the members, to nothing concerning the merits thereof. What the next move is to be is not at all certain, as the Building Committee has not reached a decision, but it is very plain that had these eighteen (18) men been allowed in the budget our work would not be behind, as it is.

REPORTS UPON THE CONDITION OF BUILDINGS

In answer to the question, "What reports upon the condition of buildings does your bureau keep?" the Superintendent of Buildings replies:

This question has been raised many, many times, but no one as yet has been able to devise any form or method which could be operated at a reasonable cost, or be of the slightest use.

Each deputy superintendent has an intimate personal knowledge of the buildings under his charge, and can answer at once definitely any question as to needs or conditions. This knowledge is supplemented by that of the inspectors, who are visiting the building daily.

One plan proposed was to have a large book in which would be entered all of the work and the cost thereof against each building. When started it was found that, to be of any service, the list of work must be in detail, represented during the season by several thousand printed pages of specifications, aside from the thousands of folios of typewritten matter.

Neither the deputy superintendents nor inspectors consulted it, as they knew what had been done, and no book could be made to show what relation that bore to the building in part or in whole, or what further things were needed, or whether proposed work was desirable or necessary.

Nothing could be devised to take the place of intimate personal knowledge where conditions were changing almost daily.

The need for repairs is clearly shown by the unrevised field notes of the inspectors, and what can be done by these same notes revised by the deputy superintendents.

The costs against each building are kept by the Auditing Bureau, and published in the Annual Financial and Statistical Report.

Accurate lists of all boilers, engines, etc., are kept, together with such memoranda as the chief of the Heating and Ventilating Division requires to keep him in touch with their condition.

Thus, when the persons raising the question have looked over the situation they have not been able to devise a workable economical scheme that would be of any real use.

It would be almost physically impossible to keep records showing condition of every thermostat, etc., in all our schools for each day. We have records showing reported troubles and how they were cared for, from which it is fair to assume that no other serious defects existed at that time. The general character of the equipment is on record in this office on a card system, which is kept up to date fairly accurately.

VENTILATION AND CLEANING

To the question, "What tests are regularly made concerning the ventilation of schools?" it is answered:

None. We have no adequate or competent staff to care for this. Fairly accurate conditions are reported by the regular heating and ventilating inspectors, as may be needed. Even the one man needed, as outlined in the Superintendent's letter to the chairman of the Committee on Buildings, would be a great help. There should be a competent man and an assistant constantly employed on this work, especially setting of dampers, etc., etc.

How many schools have humidifying apparatus?

At present eight (8) schools have some form of humidifying apparatus, six (6) with automatic control, with contracts out for eight (8) more. There are also some with hand control. We are distinctly in favor

of these installations, believing them to be necessary, and that when final determination is reached as to relation of humidity and heat, as hereto set forth, they will be very effective, especially in allaying irritation of the mucous membrane of the throat and nose.

In how many schools are air washers provided?

One, and another provided for. We wish to install others now that there is automatic control of humidity with air washing, but the committee is reserving decision pending results of investigation by the Special Committee on Ventilation.

How many have vacuum cleaning plants? What tests have been made of this method?

None have been installed, although the new high schools are piped so that the apparatus can be installed just as soon as one can be found that will satisfy the requirements. Tests have been made of all the apparatus presented.

We require that the manufacturers shall set up their machines in two rooms of a building designated by us, and that, when they are ready, they shall be tested in the presence of our mechanical engineer, electrical engineer, and the superintendent of janitors. These three men, therefore, cover the three basic elements in vacuum cleaning machines.

We require, further, that they shall not only clean, but their operation shall show sufficient saving over present methods to defray the costs of operation, oil, and electrical current, and, also, of repairs. Depreciation should be taken into consideration, and would be on a light machine.

There is no good reason why we should add to expenses by installing a machine at four thousand to six thousand dollars, plus cost of operation, etc., etc.

None of the concerns has yet been able to meet even a portion of these conditions. It would be different if our floors were carpeted.

HOW MANY SCHOOL BUILDINGS ARE FIREPROOF?

There was one in the old City of New York when the present Superintendent of School Buildings took office. That was erected in about 1867 under the influence of Mr. John Stephenson, the coach and car builder, who was a ward trustee.

The present Superintendent included in the buildings designed by him after taking office in 1891 a fireproof first story paved with asphalt. The Building Law was amended in 1894 so that all school buildings thereafter erected over thirty-five feet in height had to be made fireproof.

There was none in the territory east of the Bronx River, when it was consolidated with the City of New York in 1895. None in Queens or Richmond, and only one in Brooklyn at the time of consolidation in 1898.

The records now are:

	CLASS A All Fire- proof	CLASS B Part of Buildings on one Plot Fireproof	CLASS C First Story or Otherwise	CLASS D Brick Buildings with Wood Floor Beams	CLASS E Frame Buildings	CLASS F Buildings on one Plot of two Kinds of Construction
Manhattan	79	24	7	89	—	1
The Bronx	27	5	1	15	22	1
Brooklyn	71	11	—	103	42	—
Queens	18	9	—	27	53	—
Richmond	7	1	—	16	20	1
Totals	202	50	8	250	137	3

Is there a uniform code of fire signals in all buildings?

All buildings, of a size requiring same, have gongs of electro-mechanical, electrical, or mechanical construction, by means of which the principals may direct rapid dismissals.

Others have also, in addition, class-room bells and telephones, and signal stations placed at various parts of the buildings by means of which the need for rapid dismissal may be communicated to the principals' offices.

There is no uniform code of signals, but a suggestion as to what the City Superintendent desired was forwarded to the principals in General Circular No. 31, dated June 12, 1911. This matter is out of our jurisdiction, but we concur in suggestions offered.

What success have you had in keeping stair doors closed, as a protection against fire?

It depends largely upon the principal of the school. The Board of Superintendents has charge of the matter.

HOW THE BUILDING COMMITTEE PURCHASES PIANOS

The procedure of the Building Committee in purchasing new pianos is an interesting example of the method called "thorough." It called for bids for furnishing them, and, at the time of receiving the bids, it required each bidder to furnish a sworn statement showing the average wholesale price received by him for instruments of like quality, size, and style as those which he proposed to supply, for the period of three months prior to the date of his bid. Each statement was accompanied by a certificate vouching for its accuracy and that the prices were net prices, by a certified public accountant. The committee was thus exactly informed as to the actual trade valuation for the wholesale market of each make of piano offered, and this and the price bid were taken into account in making the award, as well as the musical and wearing qualities of the instruments and their reputation in the musical world.

SOME CHANGES WHICH WOULD IMPROVE THE WORK OF
THIS DIVISION

As to its functions the Committee on Buildings has, from time to time, asserted that the by-laws of the Board of Education should be changed so as to give that committee absolute control over its own clerks, stenographers, etc. As it is now, the Committee on Supplies is responsible for the clerical staff in the several bureaus. There is, too, a lack of unity of action which would be beneficial and economical, the Superintendent of Buildings believes, if there could be a redistribution of functions which would place the responsibility for heating, cleaning, janitors, supplies, and fuel under one committee on the Care and Heating of Buildings. Its executive officer should be a technically trained heating and ventilating engineer, and his duties should be those of designing and supervising the construction and use of the heating and ventilating apparatus in the schools, and the necessary repairs to the same, the control of janitors, and the supervision of fuel and janitorial supplies. The proposed bureau should be separate and distinct from the Bureau of Buildings save as the architect must approve all plans for new buildings.

The chief hindrances which hamper this committee in its work are insufficient appropriations, the segregation of all funds for specific purposes, instead of giving the Board of Education the necessary power to control and administer them as its internal affairs determine, an inadequate architect's staff, and the almost endless formalities which must be complied with in the conduct of its business.

CHAPTER XV

THE CARE OF BUILDINGS

FUNCTION OF THE COMMITTEE

WHEN a building is completed and ready for occupancy, its custody is turned over to the Care of Buildings Committee. This committee, according to the by-laws of the board, passes upon all requests for the use of school buildings, appoints all janitors, makes rules and regulations for their direction, prepares all schedules for their salaries, hears all charges made against janitors, and prepares an annual statement showing the amount of money which will be required for janitors' salaries and for the cleaning and disinfecting of school buildings during the next calendar year.

As some 520 janitors, and 135 firemen, cleaners, etc., were on December 10, 1911, employed directly by the Board of Education, and as each janitor (save in certain exceptional cases) is a contractor who employs the cleaners whom he finds necessary to help him, it will be seen that this committee directs an army of men and women who are responsible for the physical condition of 523 separate organizations operating a total of some 650 buildings used for school purposes.

THE DUTIES OF JANITORS

There are forty-four subdivisions in the by-law which prescribes the duties of the janitor, and an additional by-law of eight paragraphs more is required to detail the duties

of firemen who work under them, and of the principal of the school who directs them in their work. These duties are onerous, for no insurance is carried upon school buildings and the janitor must provide for their safety and preservation. He must report in writing to the principal and the Superintendent of School Buildings any damage which is done to the building; he must notify the Superintendent of School Buildings in writing whenever any contractor begins work at the school in his charge; he must examine all work being done and report any defects of material or workmanship, or any overcharge for time and materials, and any failure to comply with specifications in such work; he must keep an inventory of all articles of furniture in his building and not allow any of it to pass out of his hands without a proper written order. He is the keeper of the keys of his building. He must sweep all rooms, entries, passages, stairways, playgrounds, yards, and closets, and dust all furniture and fixtures after the close of school each day and before eight o'clock in the morning of the next school day. He must scrub the floors at least once a month and clean the windows every two months or oftener, if necessary. Sanitaries must be washed every day. Storerooms and boiler rooms must be kept in order; ashes must be removed; the temperature of all school rooms must not be less than 58° Fahrenheit at eight o'clock A. M. on school days, and shall be maintained at from 65° to 68° from nine A. M. until school is dismissed; windows are to be opened from seven to eight A. M., and ventilating apparatus is to be in full and complete operation during the school session. Snow is to be removed; roof playgrounds, sidewalks, gutters, yards, and grass plots are to be kept clean. All broken glass the janitor is to replace, and small repairs to heating apparatus, locks, doors, furniture, etc., he is required to make; all machinery and electrical apparatus must be in order. These and a score of other duties are his. This service is incalculably important, for it affects the health of every human being in the schools. At present it

is greatly hindered by a number of conditions, all of which are removable and should be removed.

THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE A LARGER STAFF

The committee in charge of this work is greatly overburdened with details which should be attended to by a competent staff of expert assistants. Its staff of inspectors (four in all) is much too small for the immense territory which they must cover. The members of the committee must now spend a considerable time in the schools, which is manifestly wrong, for they are not paid for that work nor appointed to do it. Again, the lobby of this committee room is thronged with janitors at each of its weekly meetings. Discipline is strict, and, whenever a complaint of any sort is made, the janitor in question is immediately asked to appear before the committee at its next meeting and to make an explanation. If this is not satisfactory, he is reprimanded, fined, or charges are preferred against him, and he is given a formal hearing at which he may appear with counsel. All of this takes quantities of time, particularly the last proceeding, which usually consumes hours and sometimes even days. The members of the committee give their time to this work freely and uncomplainingly, yet it is wrong that they should be compelled to do so. Above all, they should be free to discuss ways and means for this service. All matters of routine should be handled for them by paid assistants, to whom they should give counsel, oversight, and supervision. Their business should come before them in the form of reports from their subordinates as to things done, matters pending, direction sought, appeals taken, etc. All complaints could be heard by a committee made up for that purpose by the supervisor of janitors, a member of the Auditor's staff, and a member of the Superintendent's staff. The duties of such a committee could be prescribed by by-laws, and an appeal from its findings could, if need be, be taken to the Care of Buildings Committee itself.

WAYS AND MEANS OF KEEPING THE SCHOOLS CLEAN

The supervisor's staff should be strengthened. A great saving in time and efficiency would thus be possible, for the committee of the board would then be free for more important things, of which there are a number that demand its attention. First among them is the question of ways and means of keeping the schools clean. That they are kept as clean as can reasonably be expected by the method now employed is admitted by those who have examined them. But the method itself is the old and unsatisfactory one of hand labor, which is rapidly being supplanted by more thorough and more hygienic devices. The feather duster is still in vogue here. On February 21, 1911, the Medical Society of the County of Kings requested the Board of Education to abolish the method of loose dry dusting of rooms and furniture in the public schools, and to devise and enforce proper and definite methods of cleaning and sanitation of school buildings. This communication, when presented to the Care of Buildings Committee, was ordered filed. But the subject will not down. The Board of Health of the City of New York has, within the past month, February 26, 1912, repeated this request, but without further result as yet.

Janitors are forbidden to use oil on wooden stairs, classroom floors, etc. Instead, to prevent dust, they are directed to use oiled sawdust, and they are forbidden to sweep during school hours unless they have the special permission of the supervisor of janitors to do so. This rule is enforced with such success as it can be. In addition to the daily sweeping of all rooms, entries, passages, stairways, playgrounds, yards, and closets, the by-laws direct that "at least once in each school month janitors shall scrub the floors of all entries, passages and stairways, and in all rooms used for school purposes, and shall dust the side walls, blinds, and cornices," etc. Vacuum cleaning plants have not been installed in any of the school buildings of the system. Dust

is driven from one place to another or kept in motion in the air by means of feather dusters, but approved methods of removing it altogether are not yet employed.

Again, school rooms used by scores of children daily, who come from homes where all sorts of unhygienic conditions prevail, are not systematically disinfected at stated times; indeed, they are never disinfected save when contagious diseases require that the Board of Health shall take that precaution. No towels of any kind are provided for children. In these respects the leading city of the United States is much behind most other progressive cities of the country. It is indeed somewhat difficult to understand how a community which demands the perfection of sanitary detail in its hotels and its hospitals should not have found it necessary for its schools. Inability to secure funds is, in part, responsible for this omission, but the general lack of definite responsibility and authority on the part of some one for these things, coupled with the confusion and absorption which attention to an overwhelming mass of details involves, is the chief cause of it.

HOW THE WORK OF THE JANITORS IS INSPECTED

The executive officer of the Care of Buildings Committee is the supervisor of janitors, who, with three assistant supervisors, visits the school buildings, inspects the work of the janitors, and issues such instructions as may be needed. In addition, the principal of each school in submitting his monthly payroll to the Auditor of the Board of Education is required to specify whether the condition of his building has been satisfactory or not. This last device provides a general report upon the janitor's work, but can hardly do more than that. Detailed shortcomings it cannot enter into. As the Auditor cannot pay them without this report, it usually, in the nature of the case, is "satisfactory," which means simply that the janitor has earned his money. To keep men up to standard more than this is required.

An unusually demanding principal may supply it, but principals who are overburdened with other matters will not be apt to. Hence, a staff of special inspectors is required. Four men, one of whom must be in the office almost all the time, is much too small a force to cover a territory as large as Greater New York. The staff of inspectors should be at least three times as large as it now is in order that each building may be visited more frequently, as well as that more careful records of conditions may be kept. Nothing but the constant presence of the inspector will keep conditions up to a high standard. This conclusion is abundantly borne out by the reports which the members of this committee make at their meetings of conditions which they themselves find in the schools. No system of records or reports, no matter how elaborately devised, can take the place of the vigilant eye of the honest and critical overseer. No school for janitors is maintained, and instruction as to how best to perform their work must be given by the inspector who visits them. This is an important service, and there should be enough inspectors to perform it well.

A SYSTEM OF REPORTS NECESSARY

There is practically no system of reports upon the physical conditions of the schools in the office of the Care of Buildings Committee at present. Subdivision 13 of section 115 of the by-laws of the Board of Education reads: "A janitor shall report to the office of the supervisor of janitors at least once each month the condition of the heating, ventilating, electric light and power plants in the building under his charge, and sign his name in the register kept for that purpose." No such reports are made. Reports as to the operation of heating and ventilating plants are not required. Temperature records are not kept. The condition of furnaces and boilers is not a matter of record. Consequently, the use of fuel cannot be standardized, and

the scientific management of the affairs of this committee is, as yet, out of the question. The present office staff is inadequate for such work. What is needed is a thorough reorganization of ways and means, and for this the assistance of expert help will be required.

UNIFICATION OF DIRECTION NEEDED

It is difficult to serve a number of masters; a conflict of orders is inevitable, and wires which are crossed are bound to get tangled and to do much damage. Unity of organization is necessary (or, at least, as near an approach to unity of organization as can be attained). There are five different authorities set over the janitors in the schools: (1) the principal of the school, (2) the Care of Buildings Committee, (3) the Supervisor of Janitors and his assistants, (4) the Superintendent of School Buildings, (5) the Superintendent of School Supplies.

Under date of January 27, 1911, the Supervisor of Janitors reported to the Care of Buildings Committee that janitors are often summoned by bureaus of the School Department other than his own, to appear at times when the janitor is required by the by-laws to be on duty in his school building unless excused by the Committee on Care of Buildings, the principal, or the supervisor of janitors; that, in case a janitor was needed in his school on account of fire, accident, etc., or to receive supplies, or for any one of a number of reasons, the office to which he belongs would not know his whereabouts. Hereafter all bureaus requiring janitors for any purpose are directed to make application to the supervisor of janitors in writing. This rule does not, of course, carry itself out, and, with the present distribution of authority, it cannot be carried out; neither can the janitor be freed from the confusion which comes from having many masters, or the inevitable hopelessness due to his inability either to know or to do what is required of him. As long as no reports are kept as to

the condition of the heating plant in a school, and no reports are kept as to the temperature which has been supplied to the different class rooms, it is plainly impossible to standardize the amount of coal which, with reasonable care, should be consumed in keeping the building warm. And, as things now are, the janitor who undertakes to do so may on one and the same day be called before the Supplies Committee to explain why he is using so much coal, and before the Care of Buildings Committee to explain why he is not keeping his building properly heated. The committee interested in keeping the coal bills down records against him the amount of coal which he uses; the other committee keeps a record of his failure to heat his building. Here is a conflict of interest which surely should be removed. How can it be done?

REORGANIZATION IN FUNCTIONS REQUIRED

It is well that the buying should be done by one department, but the standards of quality must be worked out for it by the department which uses the commodity. When the coal is delivered it should pass into complete control of the division which must use it. The Supplies Committee should have no jurisdiction whatever over the janitors. Its relations to them should be altogether through the committee which is responsible for their work. If differences arise concerning their receiving supplies, these, too, should be referred to the authorities who control them.

There is no such clear-cut distinction between the work of the Committee on Buildings and that of the Committee on Care of Buildings in the by-laws of the board as there should be. While the Committee on Care of Buildings has charge of all matters relating to the care and custody of the schools, the Committee on Buildings has charge of all repairs, controls the furniture in the buildings, and directs the inspectors of ventilation. This cross-classification of duties is neither necessary nor advantageous. The work

of construction and maintenance is one thing; the operation and care of the building and its contents after it is ready for occupancy is another. This natural subdivision of functions should be established; all responsibility for the operation of the building should devolve upon the Care of Buildings Committee. It should have complete control, subject to the Board of Education, if the present organization is to be maintained, of all which concerns the physical operation of the school plant. It should, therefore, have as its executive officer a heating and ventilating engineer of a very high grade of efficiency who can direct the supervisor of janitors and his staff, and the inspectors of ventilation. The counsel and advice of the construction department should be constantly at his service, but executive responsibility for the maintenance of the school plant should be entirely transferred from the construction department. Originally it was thought that the Building Committee could look after the entire field of the construction, maintenance, and operation of school buildings. In time it became evident that the work involved was too heavy for the Superintendent of Buildings and his staff, and the Building Committee gave over a part of its duties to a new committee created for the purpose of assuming them. But the division of responsibility which was made was not a logical one. The new committee was given too limited a responsibility for the proper performance of its own work. It could not organize its work properly without reorganizing that of another department. Hence its inability to take the proper initiative, to form an adequate staff, and to devise a system of records which would furnish a thorough report of conditions in the schools. All these things will be possible when the proper redistribution of work is made, but not until it is made.

At present, the janitor's inventories of school furniture are in charge of the Building Committee; his conduct of the ventilating system is directed by that committee. He is directed to make certain small repairs to the heating

apparatus, locks, doors, furniture, etc.; to replace broken glass and sash cords, all of which is under the jurisdiction of the Building Committee. He is required, also, "to examine all work being done upon the premises in his charge and to report immediately to the deputy superintendent of school buildings for the borough any observation of defective materials or bad workmanship, any overcharge for time and materials, and any failure to comply with specifications." All of this he should do under the direction of his own superior officer, but to require him to do it for an officer who does not otherwise direct him is a hardship.

Since the Care of Buildings Committee directs the work of its own staff of supervisors, there is no unnecessary and conflicting distribution of authority between them. The janitors who follow their instructions are virtually controlled by a single agency. Is it possible to systematize their control still further and to eliminate the principal of the school from any authority over them? We think not, and anyone who has a thorough knowledge of school routine will agree to this. The principal of the school is, and must be, the commander of the station; whatever is done in his building must be immediately under his direction. If the doors are not open on time, or the rooms in the building are not warmed or ventilated, he must be able to give the orders necessary to put them into condition. The lives of the children are in his charge. Their comfort and their health are subject to his guardianship. He is, and must be, the resident manager of the plant. The principal is not an expert in machinery. He is there to direct the getting of certain conditions, not to prescribe in detail the steps which must be taken to get them. Whatever goes wrong in his building is a matter of immediate concern to him, and must be reported to him. No other arrangement will enable him to keep school.

There is no conflict of authority inherent in this plan of organization if it is properly carried out. The object for which buildings are built and janitors hired is to make

school keeping possible and to provide all things that are necessary for it. The committee which cares for the buildings and its staff, if it does its work properly, will first inform itself thoroughly as to what these conditions are and will consult the educational directors upon all doubtful points, and will carry out the policy which it establishes. Whatever regulations are prescribed, or orders printed, or directions given for the guidance of janitors will be intended to accomplish the very results which the careful principal will require. If such directions are carefully formulated the principal will have no occasion to enter into conflict with them or with any action which they direct. There will, of course, be the misunderstandings which attach to all human relationships, but where the functions of all concerned have been carefully systematized in this way, such occasions for misunderstanding will have been reduced to a minimum. It is an established principle of educational administration that the principal shall have sufficient authority over all who work upon the premises to safeguard the well-being of his school. Since he is under the direction of the district superintendent, all who are responsible to him should be subject to this officer's inspection.

Into the question whether the "direct" or "indirect" method of employing janitors' assistants should be used, it is not the function of this report to go, save as the question affects the educational efficiency of the schools. Which method may be the more advantageous from the standpoint of dollars and cents others must determine. There are at least three features of the direct method which menace educational efficiency. First, it enables politicians to organize a political machine of large dimensions inside the school department, and, for this reason, it is very greatly to be feared. Second, the supervision of such a staff of janitors and cleaners must, of necessity, become a much more difficult matter than it now is, when the principal of the school relies upon one man and such helpers as he employs and directs, to keep his building clean and in order. And, third,

the difficulty of getting the help which is needed when it is needed through the long routine which must be observed would very greatly complicate the problem of keeping the schools clean. The greatest objection to the indirect system is that the janitor sometimes employs his help at too low a wage. This may be obviated by the establishing of a minimum scale of wages by the Care of Buildings Committee.

DEMORALIZATION OF THE JANITORIAL STAFF

The work of this division suffers greatly from the demoralization of its staff, due to the uncertainties as to their salaries and to the city's failure to pay them for their work when payment is due. Uncertainty as to salaries is due to two causes. From 1897 up to the year 1910 the Board of Education, acting under Section 1064 of the charter, which directs it to administer all moneys appropriated for educational purposes in the City of New York, fixed the salaries of janitors, and they were paid upon receipt and audit of its payrolls. In July, 1910, the Corporation Counsel rendered an opinion based upon Section 56 of the charter, which reads "it shall be the duty of the Board of Aldermen, upon the recommendation of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, to fix the salary of every officer or person whose compensation is paid out of the city treasury other than day laborers, teachers, examiners, and members of the supervising staff of the Department of Education," etc. Since September 1, 1910, the salaries of all janitors in the school department have been fixed by the Board of Education, the Board of Estimate, and the Board of Aldermen.

At first the salary of each person so employed was fixed in this threefold way. But this method, though it seems to be the one directed by the charter, was found to be too cumbersome and to involve the city in considerable expense by necessitating it to pay the person whose rate had been fixed his established salary, no matter how his work was changed. At length, on February 14, 1911, this method

of fixing janitors' salaries was given up, and, since that time, they have been fixed by position. This entails a vast amount of work. Every increase by promotion, or the opening of additional class rooms, or additions to buildings, every transfer because of illness or necessitated by any emergency whatever, must go its weary way for formal action by the Board of Education, the Board of Estimate, and the Board of Aldermen.

The legislative department of the city is clogged with this mass of petty administrative detail; but the hardship which this method of doing business involves to the service concerned is very much greater. It is a practice of the school department when the janitor of a school building is incapacitated, or other emergency arises, which leaves a school without janitorial care, to assign the building to the janitor of a neighboring school, to be looked after by him in addition to his regular work. His compensation for this emergency work which he is required to undertake is such as barely to allow for the running expense of the building in order to prevent him from making a profit on more than one assignment. But his temporary assignment, which is a compulsory duty, requires him to pay an additional staff of assistants and to keep the buildings in running condition. As this temporary additional detail is due to an emergency, either the school which requires it must be closed until the new rate of compensation can be fixed in the regular way, or the Board of Education must meet the emergency and fix the rate of compensation as soon afterward as possible to take effect from the date of the emergency assignment. But the Comptroller's office has insisted that the new rate of payment cannot be retroactive, and takes effect from the date upon which it is fixed by resolution of the Board of Aldermen. Thus, the janitor, on the one hand, must accept his emergency assignment from the Board of Education, and, on the other hand, if he does so he faces the certainty of having to spend his own money with the assurance that he will have much difficulty, perhaps even a lawsuit, in

getting it back again. The only alternative which the Board of Education has is to close the school until such a time as all the regulations shall be complied with; but to deprive hundreds, or even thousands, of little children of their right to an education merely in order that a technicality of administration may be complied with is a much too drastic measure; so, instead, the board struggles along under this heavy handicap, but is quite unable to meet its emergencies with the strength and directness with which it should meet them, and is prevented from building up a strong, loyal, satisfied corps to care for its buildings.

Janitors are paid by the number of square feet of floor space in use in the buildings which they care for. There is a constant change in the number of school rooms in use throughout the year. From January 1, 1910, to January 3, 1911, 1,008 additional class rooms were opened and 616 were closed; or the total number of changes in class rooms during the year was 1,624. Besides, evening schools, recreation centers, and other extra activities are constantly modifying the work of the janitor, for which he has a just claim for compensation against the city. His rate of payment, if established at a given date, must be modified to correspond with these changes in his duties, and should be modified to meet the changes as they arise. It cannot be under the present arrangement. They do their work, but the city lacks a device for paying them promptly for it.

THE NEED FOR SUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS

On December 13, 1911, the Finance Committee of the Board of Education reported that the deficiency in the fund for compensation of janitors for 1911 was estimated at the beginning of the year to be \$66,920.92, and an application of this board for an issue of special revenue bonds for that amount had been favorably reported by the Comptroller to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, on the

request of the Board of Aldermen. "Certain unforeseen liabilities have accrued during the year which were not contemplated in the original calculation. The cost of janitorial services in evening and vacation activities, which fluctuates with the number of rooms in use, has been greater than anticipated." "There is also pending before the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the Board of Aldermen the matter of the fixation, under Section 56 of the charter, of certain enlarged rates of compensation for janitors who have been required to render extra services in connection with additions to buildings, new machinery installed, etc. The accrual of these liabilities will cause a further deficit of \$13,000."

The Board of Aldermen was therefore asked to adopt a resolution requesting the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to authorize the issue of thirteen thousand dollars (\$13,000) to meet this deficit.

The claims of janitors still remaining unpaid on February 23, 1912, are shown in the annexed table.

Such a condition of affairs represents a degree of hardship to employees which the City of New York ought not to visit upon them. Janitors and cleaners are not protected against want by any wide margin. The withholding of their pay after it has been earned leads to incalculable suffering. Some of them were evicted, some were driven to the loan sharks, some borrowed all they could from friends, and lived on scant rations until the city could meet its obligations.

Who is to blame for this condition in the public service? The Board of Education cannot well be blamed for undercalculating its needs, when the estimates which it submitted were cut to the extent of \$66,920.92. It should be allowed a wider margin in determining its prospective necessities. All the money which it required was finally provided by the Fiscal Department, but the method employed has proven itself an impossible one, for it destroys the service which it is designed to conserve.

UNPAID CLAIMS, FEBRUARY 23, 1912, OF JANITORS FOR YEAR 1911

P. S.	Rate	Period of Time	Arrears to End of Year	Reason
20	\$4.308 to \$4.320 per ann.	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911 (4 months)	\$4.00	Additional electric pump
22	2.544 to 2.640 per ann.	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911 (4 months)	32.00	Paved surface added
month — Dec. 19 to 25 —	\$21.00 having been made on supplementary payroll 41/11 in favor of Wm. J. Carson.	Temporary services during period mentioned, a deduction of 7/30		Temporary care

UNPAID CLAIMS, FEBRUARY 23, 1912, OF JANITORS FOR YEAR 1911

P. S.	Rate	Period of Time	Amount to End of Year	Reason
MANHATTAN				
20	\$4,308 to \$4,320 per ann.	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	\$4.00	Additional electric pump
33	2,534 to 2,620 per ann.	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	32.00	Paved surface added
161	110 per month	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	51.33	Temporary care
31	190 per month	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	51.33	Temporary care
31	190 per month	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	33.80	Temporary care
411 new	200 per day	Nov. 20 to Dec. 31, 1911	136.66	New building
188	200 per day	12 Sundays, Oct. 15 to Dec. 31, 1911	24.00	Services of cleaner
112	68.00 per month	Dec. 12 to Dec. 31, 1911	43.00	Temporary care
144 storeroom	60.00 per month	Dec. 12 to Dec. 31, 1911	21.00	Temporary care
140	90.00 per month	Dec. 12 to Dec. 31, 1911	21.00	Temporary care
141	90.00 per month	Dec. 12 to Dec. 31, 1911	21.00	Temporary care
93 new	100 to 160 per month	Dec. 4 to 31, 1911	38.00	Temporary care
			54.00	New building
			\$958.83	
BROOKLYN				
10	\$1,740 to \$4,420 per ann.	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	\$100.00	New addition
50 annex	50.00 per month	Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	500.00	Temporary care
82	100.00 per month	Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	46.66	Temporary care
141	200.00 per month	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	41.66	Temporary care
142	200.00 per month	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	41.66	Temporary care
16	330.00 per month	Sept. 25 to Oct. 24, 1911	336.33	Temporary care
Ensemble Hall	6,300 to 14,480 per ann.	Aug. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	3,358.33	Additional buildings
21	87.00 per month	Nov. 12 to 30, 1911	46.40	Temporary care
167-1	2,508 to 4,488 per ann.	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	1,396.00	New building
37	110.00 per month	June 10 to July 16, 1911	102.66	Temporary care
120	1,350 per annum	November, 1911	24.93	Temporary care
121	1,350 per annum	November, 1911	24.93	Temporary care
61	480.00 per annum	December, 1911	6.66	Temporary care
Manual Training H	1,272.00 per annum	December, 1911	21.86	Temporary care
21	127.00 per annum	December, 1911	53.00	Temporary care
119	120.00 per month	June, 1911	20.00	Temporary care
21	87.00 per month	December, 1911	43.50	Temporary care
61	60.00 per month	Nov. 1 to Dec. 28, 1911	42.50	Temporary care
120	50.00 per month	Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	124.66	Temporary care
133	50.00 per month	December, 1911	50.00	Temporary care
141	200.00 per month	Dec. 1 to 11, 1911	73.33	Temporary care
			\$7,345.65	
BROOK				
4	\$150.00 per annum	Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	\$37.50	Additional compensation
44	\$17.38 full for time	Aug. 10 to 31, 1911	51.78	Temporary compensation
44 new	3,680.00 per annum	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	1,700.00	New building
40	3,000 to 4,182 per annum	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	1,700.00	New building
40	3,000 to 4,182 per annum	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	148.41	New addition
15	480 to 720 per annum	June 14 to Oct. 31, 1911	251.34	Portable buildings
7	80.00 per month	July 17 to Aug. 31, 1911	117.33	Temporary care
26	2,083.00 per annum	Oct. 1 to 31, 1911	174.00	Regular salary
26	90.00 per month	Dec. 1 to 31, 1911	30.00	Temporary care
			\$2,461.36	
QUEENS				
73	\$18.15 per month	September, 1911	\$2.62	Temporary care
68 old	10.00 per month	Oct. 2 to Dec. 31, 1911	29.66	Temporary care
70	50.00 per month	Oct. 2 to Dec. 31, 1911	48.33	Temporary care
15 annex	50.00 per month	Sept. 25 to Dec. 31, 1911	160.00	Annex
89	3,300 to 3,780 per ann.	Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	120.00	New building
77	8,700 to 4,092 per ann.	Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	348.00	New building
77	8,700 to 4,092 per ann.	Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	348.00	New building
72	60.00 per month	June 5 to 18, 1911	28.00	Temporary care
72	60.00 per month	June 5 to 18, 1911	28.00	Temporary care
26	2,100 to 4,020 per ann.	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	640.00	New addition
Bryant High (cleaner)	50.00 per month	Dec. 1 to 14, 1911	27.53	Temporary care
18	350 to 600 per annum	December, 1911	5.00	Regular salary
16	50.00 per month	Dec. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	5.00	Regular salary
86	140.00 per month	Dec. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	66.26	Temporary care
86	140.00 per month	Dec. 15 to 31, 1911	71.66	Temporary care
			\$1,716.25	
RICHMOND				
7	\$50.00 per month	Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1911	\$200.00	Portable building
14	60.00 per month	Nov. 25 to Dec. 10, 1911	32.00	Temporary care
			\$332.00	

Total unpaid claims of janitors, 1911 \$72,955.11

Reserve for contingencies \$100.00

Total additional amount required for janitors' claims, 1911 \$73,055.11

Less cash balance in appropriation accounts, 1911 \$33,111.11

Special Revenue Bonds Required for Deficit, 1911 \$33,000.00

1 This item (\$1,396) represents aggregate amount due for September 31, 1911, at new annual rate of compensation, \$4.188 — deduction of the salary at old rate having been paid.

2 This item (\$1,396) represents aggregate amount due for period June 14 to Oct. 31, 1911, at \$2.60 per annum . . . \$74.00

3 This item (\$124.00) represents the amount due for period Dec. 1 to 25, 1911, at \$2.68 per annum . . . \$251.34

Less deduction for temporary care during absence of regular janitor, Dec. 9 to 25, 1911, 7/30 mo. 22.66

Less amount paid on supplementary roll 21/1 at rate of \$4.60 per annum \$21.00

4 This item (\$3,600) represents amount due at rate of \$50 per month for temporary services during period mentioned, a deduction of 7/30 month — Dec. 19 to 25 — \$21.00 having been made on supplementary payroll 41/1 in favor of Wm. J. Carson.

5 This item (\$124.00) represents the amount due for period Dec. 1 to 25, 1911, at \$2.68 per annum . . . \$251.34

Less deduction for temporary care during absence of regular janitor, Dec. 9 to 25, 1911, 7/30 mo. 21.00

Less amount paid on supplementary roll 21/1 at rate of \$4.60 per annum \$21.00

On December 14, 1910, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment notified the Board of Education that since the matter of adjusting the compensation of janitors and the fixation of their salaries under the provisions of Section 56 of the charter is now in the hands of a special committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, the board hereby recommends to the Board of Aldermen that, pending the report of said committee, the compensation of janitors be fixed temporarily, and until further modified in accordance with a list which followed.

Since that date all the salaries of janitors which have been fixed have been fixed temporarily pending the report of this committee. A special examiner has been investigating the service of janitors for some months, and recently he submitted a report embodying his findings. This report was sent to the Care of Buildings Committee, which immediately, in due process, requested its expert, the Auditor of the Board of Education, to examine it and to submit a report upon it. The two reports do not harmonize even upon fundamental matters. This method of adjusting difficulties and arriving at a proper procedure seems to be an impossible one. What is to be done? Disagreement is the inevitable outcome of this two-headed method of conducting the public business. Either the Board of Education should administer the schools, or the Board of Estimate and Apportionment should administer them. The question of determining what the law is at present, and whether it applies to a quasi contractor or refers only to the fixing of personal compensation, is one for the courts to settle; and, if they cannot extract a simpler method of school administration from it, the people must appeal to the legislature to remedy its defects.

The following table shows the appropriations for janitorial service for five years:

NUMBER OF BUILDINGS OWNED OR CONTROLLED BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION; AND IN CONNECTION THEREWITH, THE DEPARTMENTAL ESTIMATE, APPROPRIATIONS, CASH EXPENDITURES, ETC., ETC., FOR COMPENSATION OF JANITORS FOR THE YEARS 1907 TO 1912, INCLUSIVE

Calendar Year	Buildings Owned	Buildings Not Owned	Total Buildings	Departmental Estimate for Janitorial Service	Original Appropriation by Board of Estimate and Apportionment	Net Appropriation, After Adjustment of Transfers, Bond Issues, Etc.	Per Cent of Increase Over Next Preceding Year	Cash Expenditures	Per Cent of Increase Over Next Preceding Year
1907	492	54	546	\$1,392,459.77	\$1,342,459.58	\$1,273,584.80	\$1,263,649.46
1908	500	49	549	1,520,696.86	1,408,846.86	1,390,921.54	\$9.21	1,379,860.35	9.19
1909	514	50	564	1,548,132.60	1,398,000.00	1,413,308.35	1.60	1,413,198.58	2.41
1910	515	43	558	1,605,846.10	1,393,141.41	1,473,141.41	4.23	1,447,269.75	2.41
1911	518	43	561	1,584,646.60	1,402,697.60	1,469,618.52	0.23 ¹	1,469,504.40	1.53
1912	520	40	560	1,576,972.60	1,513,576.92	1,513,576.92	2.99	366,795.30 ²

¹ Decrease.

² Payments for three (3) months.

CHAPTER XVI

THE FURNISHING OF SUPPLIES

THE furnishing of supplies to keep so large an undertaking going is a colossal task. Certain conditions hinder it which ought to be removed. One thing greatly needed is a central storehouse, instead of three storehouses and a basement which the bureau now uses. "We have been trying for years to secure a central depository capable of holding all material necessary for a three to six months' supply for the schools, but have been unable to secure it. We did the best we could with the building at 418 East 68th St., but the Building Department of the City of New York has stepped in and said we were overloading the floors, with the result that we cannot purchase supplies in large quantities, as in the past." This matter of a storehouse is under way.

Another urgent requirement is more money for school supplies. The appropriations for 1911 were so low that, after the schools had been kept on something like a starvation basis for the greater part of the year, it became necessary to ask for an additional appropriation of \$100,000 in Special Revenue Bonds to provide books, pens, ink, and paper to finish the work of the year. Only \$75,000 was allowed. So the schools entered upon 1912 behindhand in equipment for school work. The Committee on Supplies presented a budget showing what it, to the best of its ability, believed to be the minimum amount required for the year 1912. The Board of Estimate and Apportionment made considerable reduction in this estimate, and the Board of Aldermen made an arbitrary cut of \$50,000 from it. Prin-

cipals were, therefore, again ordered to go upon scanty rations and to give the essentials, that is, textbooks, pens, ink, and paper, the preference in making their requisitions. They were notified that the committee knew of no money which had been appropriated for the extension of kindergartens, work shops, kitchens, science rooms, etc. In the past the Bureau of Supplies had been able to make prompt deliveries during the month of January because through its management it was able to carry a surplus stock from one year to another. The cuts in the estimates for 1911 made it impossible to carry over any stock with which to supply all the schools with their necessities by February 1 of this year. For the first time in years the bureau had to ask the schools to wait until such time after the supplies were due as it could furnish them. Instead of sending supplies, it sent a statement of the reasons why it could not send them.

ITS METHOD OF FURNISHING SUPPLIES

The method of furnishing supplies is as follows: When the appropriations are made a fund is set apart for each school, against which its principal draws his requisitions. The apportionment for the year 1912 is made on the basis of the following allowance per child enrolled during the preceding month of November, as that has been found to be fairly representative of the enrollment for the year.

PUPILS — Kindergarten	@ \$0.75
Primary	@ .95
Grammar (4A to 6B)	@ 1.40
Grammar (7A to 8B)	@ 2.40
Special	@ 1.00
Cooking	@ .60
Shop-work	@ .50

That these ratios of allowance are not satisfactory to the principals who are responsible for the work of the schools,

the following carefully prepared report made by a committee appointed for that purpose by the Principals' Association shows:

CITY OF NEW YORK, May 12, 1911.

*Committee on Supplies,
Board of Education,
Park Ave. and 59th St.,
New York City.*

GENTLEMEN, — Because of a quite general agreement among the principals that the best interests of this city demand a larger appropriation for supplies, our Association instructed its Committee on Principals' Interests to investigate the matter. In compliance with these instructions this committee formulated a questionnaire and sent a copy to each principal in the City of New York, with a view to learning the exact conditions and obtaining from the principals an opinion as to what allotment would make it possible to meet all just demands.

This committee has very carefully gone over all replies, and begs leave to submit to you the result, trusting that some way may be found to relieve a condition which is already causing just complaints from parents, and which must continue to grow worse unless relief is obtained very soon.

A very large majority of the principals replying say that they are compelled to use books that, for sanitary or other reasons, ought to be destroyed. Many books are being used that have been in use for several years. Many complaints have been received from parents relative to the condition of books their children are compelled to use. Principals cannot remedy this unless they are given larger appropriations with which to buy books.

After most careful consideration this committee is

of the opinion that the following amounts are the minimum which should be allowed per pupil for the grades specified: Kindergarten, 75 cents; 1A to 3B, \$1; 4A to 6B, \$1.70; 7A to 8B, \$2.50; shop, 75 cents; cooking, 70 cents. Since it is the general opinion that girls are more careful of books and other supplies than boys, a reduction of not more than ten per cent on the above proposed allotment for girls in grades 1A to 3B, 4A to 6B, 7A to 8B, might be considered the most reasonable way of reducing the total allowance, if it is found that a reduction is imperative. In behalf of our association, we beg that you will make every effort to secure for the schools the relief which we ask and which we feel sure you will see is urgently needed.

Very respectfully,

(Signed)

THEOPHILUS JOHNSON, *Chairman*,
LEWIS A. BEARDSLEY,
LEON W. GOLDRICH,
MAURICE J. THOMPSON,
JOHN DOTY,
RUFUS A. VANCE, *Member ex officio*.
Committee on Principals' Interests.

Supporting evidence is found in the following passages from a communication to the Committee on Supplies by the City Superintendent, dated April 25, 1911:

"I fear that the schools are slowly being crippled through lack of necessary supplies. At least, principals are beginning to complain that they cannot furnish all the textbooks and reading matter their pupils require because their allowance is so small. If you will glance at the following table you will see that the amount expended for books, charts, maps, etc., since 1905 has not increased in proportion to the increase in school register. The increase in school register since 1906

is 16 per cent; the increase in expenditure for books, etc., has been only 3 per cent, as between 1906 and 1910. Furthermore, there was actually less spent in 1909-10 for this purpose than in 1907-8. Under these circumstances there seems good reason to believe that the schools are being crippled through ill-judged parsimony in supplying books and school apparatus. Would it not be well to have a special inquiry made into this subject?

Year Ending July 31st	Average Monthly Register	Increase	Expenditure for Supplies, Including Textbooks, Etc.
1906	568,130	17,024	\$1,291,400.90
1907	591,653	23,523	1,355,985.55
1908	617,341	25,688	1,498,666.42
1909	639,323	21,982	1,254,241.27
1910	659,495	20,172	1,333,322.69

"Per cent increase in average register, 1910 over 1906 = 16 +.

"Per cent increase in expenditures for supplies, including textbooks, etc., 1910 over 1906 = 3 +.

"The quality of some of the supplies is inferior because of lack of money to purchase better. This is noticeably the case in the supplies of pens and scissors."

The Committee on Supplies furnishes each superintendent with a statement of the amount set aside for each school under his supervision. Each principal or head of a school is permitted to order supplies from the official lists. When they need supplies other than those on the official lists, they must specify on the requisition for such supplies the estimated cost of same.

The following instructions are printed in the supplies list:

"Before forwarding requisitions to the superintendent in charge of school see that all sheets are legible,

and figure up amount to ascertain if the unexpended balance will cover the same.

“Requisitions in excess of appropriation must not be sent to the Bureau of Supplies until money has been appropriated by the Committee on Supplies to meet the deficiency.”

Requisition books are arranged in quintuplicate form, the intention being that the original, duplicate, and triplicate copies shall be forwarded to the Bureau of Supplies; the quadruplicate copy to be retained by the superintendent in charge of the school, who is to stamp the receipt on back of same and file it according to the number of the school, so that it may be available at any time for such information as he may require. The quintuplicate copy is to be retained by the principal in the requisition book, to show the details of the articles ordered. The quintuplicate copy is arranged for the benefit of the principal of the school as follows:

Amount allotted to the school for the year 191 . . .	\$
Drawn to date	\$
Still available	\$
This requisition	\$
Balance available	\$

If these figures are carried out the superintendent can deduct the amount of requisitions received from the last balance and he will have the amount still available.

It frequently happens that requisitions are held by the superintendent for various reasons for a considerable period. These requisitions are liabilities against the fund until canceled and should be considered.

Requisitions received by the Bureau of Supplies after the first of the month are considered as applicable to the first of the following month.

All contracts for the furnishing of supplies are made annually by means of competitive bids. Standards of

quality and character of supplies are determined by the judgment of the experts in the several departments. In receiving deliveries of supplies the superintendent takes samples at random from the whole quantity delivered and compares them with the standard which is the basis of the contract. As he and certain members of his staff have become expert in testing supplies, there is, if their work is well done, very little opportunity for the contractor to fill his order with goods which do not come up to standard.

A list of supplies authorized to be used in the several kinds of schools is printed and distributed to principals. Each item on this list is numbered and described, the name of the contractor furnishing it, and its price is given. Separate requisitions must be made for each of the following classifications:

1. Special supplies for use in day and evening high schools.

2. Drawing supplies.

3. Stationery.

4. Sewing.

5. Kindergarten.

6. Domestic science.

7. Library, nurses, miscellaneous.

8. Pens and pencils.

9. Physical training.

10. Records.

11. Special supplies.

12. Work shop (exclusive of lumber).

13. Lumber.

14. Elementary science.

15. Typewriters, mimeographs, and supplies for the same.

Requisitions must conform to the rules and the list; number, quantity, description of the item, name of the contractor, price, extension, and totals must be correct or they are returned. A six weeks' supply of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, but not more, may be ordered

at one time. Requisitions for a six months' supply of items 5, 7, and 11 are accepted. Items of a permanent character that may be required for the work of the term may be ordered at one time. All requisitions, except janitors', must be in the Bureau of Supplies not later than the first of the month for delivery during the succeeding month. When the items on a requisition are not all delivered, each item delivered is checked and the requisition is returned to the bureau in order to secure delivery of the other items. When all items are delivered, the principal receipts the requisition and returns it. If a shortage in delivery occurs, a memorandum is made on the requisition and the claim is investigated on the day of delivery, if possible. All deliveries are checked on the copy of the requisition retained in the school as well as on the copy which the driver presents. All requisitions must be approved by the superintendent in charge of the school.

In addition, the Supplies Committee exercises the prerogative of approving or disapproving certain items on the requisitions as the condition of the funds or the character of the goods requisitioned for may dictate. It exercises this privilege rather vigorously when funds are low, and, in 1911, it limited the schools rather drastically to supplies which, in its judgment, were "absolutely essential." The work of the bureau is greatly retarded by the volume of detail which it is compelled to observe whenever the shortage of funds involves a disarrangement of its methods of accepting requisitions.

The method of requisitioning for textbooks, janitors' supplies, etc., is much the same.

No school is at any time allowed to exceed its balances for supplies. It is not allowed to send requisitions in excess of its appropriations until the Committee on Supplies has appropriated money with which it may meet its deficiency. Application must be made for an increased allowance, accompanied by data giving in detail the number of pupils in each grade, the changes which have taken

place, etc. This, too, must be approved by the superintendent in charge. If conditions are believed to warrant the additional allowance asked for, it is granted. The Superintendent of Supplies testifies that the principals coöperate carefully and well with his office, both in requisitioning for supplies and in receiving and caring for them. They inventory their stock on hand once a year, and carry little or no superfluous stock in the schools.

On the other hand, there is vigorous complaint about the quality of supplies, the quantity furnished, and the lack of promptness in filling requisitions. The bureau needs more educational oversight. It cannot serve its purposes as an independent division. The necessity for a general manager, who, at the same time, supervises the schools, is very apparent here.

One difficulty with the system is that changes may be ordered in the course of study or in subjects by those in authority over these matters without sufficient inquiry as to the cost of such changes and the financial ability of the department to carry them into effect. This is an illustration of the failure of a departmental system, uncontrolled by a general manager, to unite and coöperate in the performance of a single work.

The present method of furnishing supplies to the schools is not satisfactory to those who are responsible for operating it. Principals now choose their textbooks and supplies from an open list. They may select the articles best suited to their pupils' needs, or they may not. The matter of issuing supplies is not as thoroughly controlled as it is felt that it should be. On October 11, 1911, the Committee on Supplies reported to the Board of Education that it had given very careful consideration to the matter of the establishment of a tariff of supplies to be furnished to the public schools. Prior to 1898 such a tariff was embodied in the by-laws of the Board of Education of the former City of New York, showing the number of books, slates, pencils, etc., allowed for every hundred pupils, and

also the quantity of other supplies allowed for each school building. The committee presented the following communication upon this subject, addressed to it under date of October 5, 1911, by the Superintendent of School Supplies:

“As you are aware, I have advocated in the past the establishment of a tariff for supplies in place of our present per capita basis. Within a recent period certain demands have been made upon the Bureau of Supplies for statistics of various kinds which it has been impossible to furnish because of our present method of doing business; for instance, we were asked on one occasion to specify the cost of supplies for certain grades; again, we were asked to state the value of the stock in the schools at a particular time and the quantity of supplies consumed within a given period. While I do not admit that the tariff will enable me to give the latter data, I could, with the tariff, furnish the former. The tariff method of furnishing supplies will also enable us to lay the foundation to prepare almost any line of information regarding the quantity of supplies needed for any grade in the schools. To do so, however, the coöperation of the educational division is necessary, i. e., they must prepare a comprehensive tariff outlining each line of supplies necessary for each grade and the quantity required per pupil. If this is done we can make all necessary calculations when we have the number of pupils who must be supplied with books and other essentials. By this method each school will be on an equal footing on the first of each year; principals will not have to bother about dollars and cents, and all that will be necessary for them to do is to ask for the supplies to which they are entitled. It will be possible, under the same conditions, closely to estimate the amount that will be required each year for any subject. Under the present basis some principals may receive too much and others not enough.

Those receiving too little will naturally ask for more, with the result that both the principals and the Bureau of Supplies are placed in the position of trying at all times to make ends meet, and, as a consequence, the children may suffer. I, therefore, deem it wise to ask you to present a resolution recommending to the Board of Education to request the Board of Superintendents to prepare a comprehensive tariff of supplies whereby it will be possible for the bureau to tell how many books are necessary for each grade, and also all other lines of supplies."

The committee so recommended, and the Board of Education adopted a resolution requesting the Board of Superintendents to prepare a comprehensive tariff of supplies to be furnished in the public schools in the City of New York. Here the matter rests, for, as yet, such a tariff has not been submitted by the Board of Superintendents.

CHAPTER XVII

THE BUREAU OF LECTURES, AND OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

NEW YORK CITY has the distinction of having devised and maintained the largest and most splendid scheme in the world for utilizing school buildings outside of school hours. The credit for this great achievement belongs to the City Superintendent of Schools, the Supervisor of Lectures, and the Board of Education. Reference to the table which summarizes the activities of the year will show that 20,085 persons attended the evening recreation centers, 657,619 used the vacation baths, 19,631 availed themselves of the evening roof playgrounds, 105,897 used the vacation playgrounds, and 20,367 attended the vacation schools. The total attendance at the evening lectures was 955,074; the average attendance was 176.

THE NEED FOR SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Too much cannot be said in praise of such extensions of the usefulness of the school system. Nothing but the lack of funds keeps it from doing a vastly larger work in these ways and in others, such as in opening summer schools for teaching the English language to foreigners, opening great numbers of special classes for teaching manual work after school hours, etc. The superintendents have urged the claims of these activities. A large city must fit its schools to the needs of its people by furthering all the supplementary forms of school service which will actually minister to public needs.

A report of the City Superintendent of Schools, under date of October 25, 1911, reads:

"Inasmuch as playgrounds for children draw their patrons only from their immediate surroundings, it is obvious that the beneficent effects of public school playgrounds are limited only by the amount of money available to appoint instructors and to supply the very meager equipment required. Were the appropriations sufficient every school building in a congested neighborhood could be opened every afternoon with incalculable advantage to the children of the vicinity, certainly from the beginning of June until the end of September, and many of them throughout the year.

"The vacation schools and the evening recreation centers should be at least doubled in number. Attention is called to the success of the 'continuation classes' in the vacation schools. It points clearly to the time when the public schools will be open, in part at least, all the year round or when the summer vacation will be confined to the month of July. The playgrounds maintained by your board are distinguished by the following characteristics:

"1. Because public school buildings are found in every part of the city, they may bring opportunities for rest, for recreation, and for escape from the streets, within easy reach of every child.

"2. The use of public school grounds and buildings for recreative purposes involves no additional outlay for purchase of ground or erection of buildings.

"3. The public school playgrounds depend for their attractiveness not on expensive equipment, but on the human and social element of skilful leadership and absolute fair play in games, and on the judicious intermingling of play with recreative cultural work.

"4. They provide play and rest space not merely for the adolescent boys and girls who are strong and able

to fight for their rights in street and park, but for the infant in arms, for the child of tender years, and even for the mothers who have no other escape from noise, and dust, and heat."

The board is to be commended also for its provision of special classes for deaf, blind, crippled, tuberculous, anæmic, and mentally defective children. Only a beginning has been made in these activities, and that against tremendous difficulty in the way of securing funds. A much more liberal policy is desired to favor their growth.

The Public School Athletic League, too, is an organization of the greatest possible value, and well deserves the support and encouragement which the Athletic Committee of the Board of Education gives it.

THE PUBLIC FREE LECTURES

The Public Free Lecture System is a monument to the genius for service of the man who both originated it and has perfected its working through the years. In it New York City has contributed a new type of public school education to the world, one which will undoubtedly spread to every city of importance in the nation. What has been done by this bureau represents, therefore, a new educational movement of the greatest significance. Lectures were given in one hundred and seventy-seven centers during the year 1911-12. They were given in four languages: English, German, Yiddish, and Italian. They were originally called "Lectures to Working Men and Women," and lectures to working men and women they are primarily and always will be. They are upon various subjects, which are classified under literature, history, sociology, art, general and applied science, descriptive geography, and the special lectures in foreign languages. The lectures are carefully chosen, carefully announced, carefully arranged for, and carefully reported upon when given. A thorough system

obtains in this bureau. Inspectors are employed to report upon the condition of the hall, the character of the audience present, and the success and value of the lecture which is given. A more thorough system of records could not well be devised. Upon the basis of the reports which are kept subjects are chosen and lecturers are reemployed. There is little opportunity for unprofitable work in this division. It is one of the best examples of scientific management which we have seen.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

SECTION 1087 of the Revised Charter directs the Board of Education to divide the boroughs under its charge into forty-six local school board districts. "There shall be in each of said districts a local school board consisting of seven members, as follows: Five persons to be appointed by the president of the borough, a member of the Board of Education, designated by the president of that board, as hereinafter provided, and the district superintendent assigned to duty in such district by the City Superintendent." All the members of the local school boards serve without pay and are residents of the districts in and for which they are appointed. The charter directs them to meet as often as their duties require, but not less than once in each month, excepting July and August.

THEIR DUTIES

Subject to regulation by the by-laws of the Board of Education, their duties are as follows: (a) to visit at least once a month the schools of their districts and inspect them as to punctual and regular attendance of teachers and pupils, the studies, progress, and order and discipline of the pupils, the cleanliness, safety and ventilation of the buildings, etc. They also report in writing to the Board of Education, on or before the 1st of January and June of each year, in respect to the condition of the schools, the efficiency of teachers, and the wants of the districts, especially in regard

to schools and school premises; (b) they shall report whenever additional kindergarten and elementary school accommodation is necessary, and recommend the erection of buildings and such repairs as they see fit, the hiring of premises, etc.; (c) they shall at once report any dereliction of duty on the part of any member of the staff of the board; (d) they shall have power to excuse absences of teachers, subject, however, to the approval of the Board of Superintendents in cases where teachers are excused without pay; (e) they shall try and determine all matters relating to discipline, corporal punishment, and other matters affecting the administration of the schools, but they shall take up complaints against teachers only after a report by the principals; (f) they shall have the power and the duty to try charges made by a principal, the district superintendent, or a parent residing in the district against a teacher for gross misconduct, insubordination, neglect of duty, or inefficiency; (g) they shall present charges of any dereliction of duty on the part of janitors; (h) they shall see that the sanitary and health regulations of the Board of Education are enforced; (i) they shall report all vacancies in the teaching force; (j) they shall have power to transfer teachers within their districts; (k) they shall have the power and the duty to adopt by-laws not in conflict with the by-laws of the Board of Education.

This is an extensive program of duties, and not an altogether well-considered one. Several of the functions enumerated properly belong to the district superintendents and are discharged by them.

ARE THEY PERFORMED BY THEM?

In order to find out whether or not the local school boards were performing their duties as prescribed by law, a letter of inquiry, under date of February 27, 1912, was addressed to the secretary of each local school board, asking thirteen definite questions covering, for the year 1911, the perform-

ance of the duties outlined in the charter. Thirty out of the forty-six replied; one of them, that of district number 11, that the communication had been filed; a second request for an answer brought the response that the board had not yet decided what it should do in the matter. All of the twenty-nine reported that minutes are kept of all their meetings, but the answers to subsequent questions did not in all cases bear out this statement. Twenty-two reported the number of meetings attended by their members as they were asked to do. Four reported that their members "attended uniformly." Only nine boards reported their record of visits for the year. These nine reported a total of 682 visits made. One of them, that of district 33, reported 206 visits by its members; number 1, 66; number 5, 26; number 8, 17; number 12, 59; number 18, 97; number 19, 78; number 21, 58; and number 22, 75. Ten reported that no record of visits was kept. Eighteen reported that they had made the prescribed written report to the Board of Education for January and July, and nine that they had not reported both times. The records of the Board of Education show that only twenty-four of the forty-six local school boards made a report last year.

All of the twenty-nine boards replied that they had called the attention of the Board of Education to matters requiring its official notice at other times during the year. Five declared that they had reported derelictions of duty on the part of members of its staff to the Board of Education, and twenty-four that there had been no occasion to do so. Twenty-two reported the need for additional school accommodations within the year. Seven reported that they had granted 990 leaves of absence to teachers, and six that they had granted 589 excuses for absence. Eight reported that they had held trials upon charges duly prepared. Action was taken in regard to the enforcement of sanitary regulations in schools by twenty-five boards. One board transferred one teacher, and one board reported forty-seven vacancies. The others reported no action in these particulars. Twenty-

two boards have adopted by-laws by which to conduct their business; seven have not.

From a careful reading of all the reports which the local boards made to the Board of Education, and also a great number of letters from their members concerning their work, we are convinced of two things in regard to them: First, that a few local boards take their duties seriously, are very energetic, and helpful to the schools of their districts; and second, that at present, on the whole, the local school boards are but a feeble arm of the school service. The opportunities which they have for service are tremendous. They must, if possible, be brought to embrace them.

The following reasons for the existence of local school boards, submitted by two of their members who are active in them, seem to us to state the need for them exactly:

“The local school board seems a desirable and necessary part of the effective school organization and administration in New York City for the following reasons:

“1. Because it is a means by which public interest may be brought into direct contact with the schools of each district, and with the school system as a whole.

“2. Because it is a means by which the particular educational needs of each district may be studied by disinterested citizens outside of the school system and yet in touch with it. Local school board members should be in a position to study and know the other agencies affecting child welfare at work in each district, and should be able, therefore, to understand its educational needs, and, on the basis of this knowledge, to present suggestions of possible modifications and changes in the schools of the district to fit these needs. In other words, the local school board is a means by which great adaptability to local needs may obtain in the schools of each district.

“3. Because in so large a system more personal

supervision of the housekeeping side of school administration, including ventilation and the physical care of the children, etc., and more personal interest to encourage principals and teachers is needed than can possibly be provided by the Board of Education.

"N. B. Should the size of the present Board of Education ever be decreased, all of these reasons why the local school boards are desirable and necessary would become more cogent."

CAUSES FOR THEIR DISSATISFACTION

Why have the local school boards in large measure failed to use their opportunity? A considerable body of information has been collected from them which bears upon this subject. It shows a general discontent on the part of local board members with their situation. They feel that they have responsibility, but little or no authority. "The local school board is a part of the system but has no power whatever." "If the local school boards had more positive powers, or if some of the power now held by the main board were placed in the joint control of the local and main boards, more effective coöperation could probably be had. As it is now, their powers are essentially recommendatory." "The Board of Education does not make any effort to secure our coöperation at all." "Our board takes the initiative and receives courteous attention, and, generally, its recommendations are complied with, though after many days." Another board objects that the Board of Superintendents usurps the functions of the local boards. Still another board reports that it maintains the closest relations with the Board of Education through Mr. ——. "It is vitally necessary that the commissioner attend every meeting of the local board." But another, "Local boards are mere figureheads or messengers." "The difficulty is due to referring deliberations of local boards to supervisory heads of departments instead of committees of the Board

of Education." Another board, "We are most fortunate in having a central board member who attends all meetings." "There should be some method of getting rid of members who do not attend regularly." "Its powers should not be increased, but should be recognized by the City Superintendent and others in authority. We have gotten every educational facility for our district that the city offers from buildings, sites, down to proper furniture, and we intend to get everything for our children that we can." Quite opposed to this is this one: "The local boards, limited in authority as they are, are useless. I am, however, a firm believer in local boards with wider scope and authority, not only to recommend, but to carry into effect such recommendations."

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LOCAL BOARD

What is the function of the local school board? It is the resident protector of the schools of its district. It is the official promoter of the schools in its community. Its function is to interpret them to the people and the people to them. It is an official board of school visitors representing the parents of the district, to call upon the schools and to make itself acquainted with their work. District superintendents and principals visit the class rooms from the official end of the system, the local board visits them from the people's end. It should function in bringing parents and teachers together, in holding school meetings, in bringing parents into the school, and in establishing and keeping up good relations between them.

From the standpoint of the people, again, it reports the school needs of the neighborhood to the Board of Education. It acts as a court of first instance in settling difficulties. The Board of Education is too far away to be in personal touch with both the community and the school. The local board supplies the element of watchfulness, interest, and support. It cares for the personal and local sides

of the district's school activities, pointing out to teachers, superintendents, and members of the Board of Education ways in which more things and better things can be done; and to parents and teachers how they can work together to accomplish them. There is a place for such local official guardians of the public schools, and those boards which are giving themselves energetically to their duties are performing a very necessary work.

It is my belief that too many powers and duties are given to them in the charter. Confusion has resulted in their minds as to what their duties are. Unless the present diffused system of school administration is to be still further diffused and dismembered, their functions ought not to be increased, but lessened. I agree heartily with one of their members who writes: "I would not urge that the powers of the local boards should be very greatly increased. It would be unfortunate to have forty-six separate bodies in forty-six different localities, each with the power to decide important questions as to school sites and school buildings, for instance. Such matters must be decided in the end by a central body having in view the interests of the city at large. . . . There are many things now done by the central authorities over the heads or without the approval of the local boards which might better first be submitted to and approved by the appropriate local board."

The chief function of the local board should be the visiting and inspection of schools; but they should be without power to interfere with class-room work; instead, they should consult the district superintendent upon such matters.

They should also report any dereliction of duty on the part of school officials which comes to their attention. They should continue to hear charges against principals and teachers, if any are made. And they should make recommendations as to the need for additional school accommodations, repairs, etc. If their work could be thus simplified and made definitely recommendatory, and not administra-

tive, more time should be spent by them in visiting class rooms and less in holding local board meetings. There would seem to be little necessity for them to meet regularly more than once in every two months. What is needed, and what does not now exist, is an agency for keeping the local school boards up to their mission. The Board of Education has not concerned itself sufficiently with them. Its minutes show that its committees do consider their recommendations and act upon them; it almost never fails to confirm their findings upon the charges which they have heard; but it has not bothered itself, beyond a resolution to refer communications concerning local matters to local boards for consideration, with working out ways and means of enlisting them more vigorously in support of the schools. It does not call conventions of local board members; it does not, as a rule, send for them to explain local conditions and needs; it does not refer as many matters to them as it should for report and suggestion. When they fail to send in their reports on time, or altogether, it does not send for them. Not enough copies of the minutes of its committee meetings are printed to supply them, if nothing else was done with them. They ought to be taken into the system and to be made an integral part of it. The records which have been furnished us show that, wherever the central board member is faithful and active in the local school board, the local school board is an efficient factor in the schools of its district.

Most members of the central board seem to overlook this duty altogether. Some one officer in the general offices should be charged with the duty of working out the details of a plan of coöperation with the local boards and of requiring reports upon their work. He should, with the constant assistance of the Board of Education itself, and of all of its division officers, build up and maintain a scheme of interrelations between the central and the local boards. There is plenty of evidence that teachers and principals find them helpful and coöperate with them. There is no need

for a division of administrative functions between them and the central board, but rather for the building up of an interested and watchful body of official public school overseers, coöperating with the Board of Education by reports and advice, and helping it to build up a strong and informed public opinion to support the cause of the schools.

CHAPTER XIX

A SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

WE therefore recommend :

First. That the law governing the administration and control of school affairs be strictly followed.

Second. That the courts be called upon to interpret such parts of it as are obscure, in order definitely to fix the responsibility of the Board of Education and all municipal boards and officers for the administration of the schools.

Third. That new legislation be asked for in order to unify the control of the schools in such matters as require unification to make effective administration possible.

Fourth. As every division of the educational service is hampered and hindered by shortage of funds, and by lack of control on the part of the Board of Education of the funds appropriated for school purposes, the board should control its own funds in order to administer the school affairs of the city.

Fifth. A method of appropriation of public money for educational purposes should be adopted by which estimates of needs and public money provided to meet them will be more nearly identical than they now are.

Sixth. Methods of accounting to the city should be simplified to the utmost degree compatible with honesty of administration.

Seventh. External hindrances to the administration of the schools of the city should be removed by carrying out the established policy of the state to "separate public education and the control and management of the schools from

all other municipal interests and business," by making the Board of Education independent and giving it the power to determine the amount of money needed for school purposes as has been done in other leading cities of the United States — Boston, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Kansas City, Indianapolis, and others.

Eighth. New York City should have a Board of Education small enough to provide a united, informed, and energetic administration of the schools. Such a board should not be paid, for that would put the executive management of education into the hands of laymen, whereas it belongs to educators. The Board of Education represents the people, to perform for them the delegated function of selecting and employing the technical staff who are to conduct the work of the schools; legislating and making policies to guide them; considering reports from them; examining into the sufficiency of their plans and their service; upholding them as long as their work is satisfactory, and putting others in their places as soon as it ceases to be so.

Ninth. That the Board of Education systematize its work by clearly separating its functions from those of the several members of its executive staff.

Tenth. That there be a general manager of the undertaking. For the conduct of an educational work he must be the Superintendent of Schools.

Eleventh. That the general manager should be *ex officio* a member of the Board of Education; that his position upon all matters upon which official action is taken may be made a matter of record; and that needless jealousy of function between the Board of Education and the director of the undertaking may be eliminated.

Twelfth. The Board of Education should retain for itself the necessity of becoming acquainted with its work as a whole and of employing the informed and deliberate judgment of the whole body to conduct its business. All executive functions should be turned over to its executive staff, which should therefore be increased. The number of stand-

ing committees should be cut down and the work of committees should be limited to the preparation of business to be submitted to the board for consideration.

Thirteenth. That the functions of the City Superintendent of Schools be defined in such a way as to give him authority commensurate with his *de facto* responsibility.

Fourteenth. There is need for a codification of the laws governing the work of the Department of Education, and the Board of Education should have a salaried legal adviser of its own to protect the educational interests.

Fifteenth. The responsibility for conducting the medical examinations of school children, to discover physical defects which interfere with their progress in education, should be in the hands of the Department of Education.

Sixteenth. The necessary enlargement of the statistical staff should be made to enable it to carry out its plan of reporting the cost of education per student hour of instruction. There should be but one statistical division.

Seventeenth. A bureau of investigation and appraisal should be created for the collection of information concerning developments in education, and for the elaboration of scientific standards by which it should measure the results attained by instruction in the city schools.

Eighteenth. The financial statistics which are published in the reports of the board are confusing, since part of them are for the school year and part of them for the fiscal year. If possible this confusion should be eliminated by the publication of but one authoritative financial report per annum.

Nineteenth. We recommend that a department of records be established, in charge of trained experts, to supervise the mechanical preparation of all printed records and reports; to keep them indexed to date, supplying a cumulative index covering a period of years; and to conduct a filing department for the filing and supervision of all the records of the board after they have ceased to be in constant use.

Twentieth. That the speculative elements in estimates of the Board of Education be reduced to approximations to

certainly by basing the estimates on statistics of expansion in the departments through a period of years. That a more liberal allowance per pupil be used in calculating the amount required for school supplies; and that the standards of maintenance set by the Board of Education for the upkeep of school buildings be allowed.

Twenty-first. That the Board of Education be authorized to fix the salaries of its own office staff, and be provided with sufficient funds to employ the necessary help, and be given complete control over its own schedules, enabling it to make such transfers, promotions, and additions to its staff as the exigencies of its work may require. A revision of the charter is necessary before the Board of Education can fix the salaries of its office force.

Twenty-second. We recommend that the proposed scientific study of the location of school sites be undertaken as soon as possible.

Twenty-third. We recommend a return to the greatly simplified process of adopting school-building plans outlined in the charter (1073), and that the school-building fund be allotted in bulk, to be administered by the Board of Education.

Twenty-fourth. That a bureau for the care, heating, and ventilation of school buildings be created, with a technically trained and experienced heating and ventilating engineer at its head, and that the Bureau of School Buildings be relieved of these functions.

Twenty-fifth. That the entire control of the janitorial service be placed in the hands of the Board of Education.

Twenty-sixth. As the funds for school supplies are inadequate and the quantity, quality, and promptness of delivery of school supplies unsatisfactory, that more money be appropriated for this purpose, and a more satisfactory method for furnishing such supplies be devised.

Twenty-seventh. Money should be provided as liberally as it can be for the extension of the supplementary school activities, such as vacation schools, vacation playgrounds,

recreation centers, instruction of foreigners in the English language, evening lectures, and special classes for deaf, blind, crippled, tubercular, anæmic, and mentally deficient children.

Twenty-eighth. That the legal duties of the local school boards be simplified in such a way as to make their chief duty that of visiting and inspecting the schools and developing the interest of the community in them. The Board of Education should do everything in its power to make the local boards an integral part of the organized school service.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

THE " TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-ONE QUESTIONS " WHICH WERE
ASKED " TO TEST THE RELIABILITY OF THE REPORT." ¹

" It is n't safe to ask questions unless you are willing to hear the answers." — *Crothers*.

SUMMARY OF THE QUESTIONS.

(1) Questions like this — " We have directed you to go from New York to Boston; now to show us that you have done so please tell us what you saw at Philadelphia "	145
(2) Misquoting the report	21
(3) Already answered in the report	41
(4) Asking for basis for conclusions or for the privilege of making the investigation at this point on the assumption that the question-asker has been properly trained to make such judgments and the investigator has not	16
(5) Asking for clearer statements when those already made are clear	6
(6) Asking for supplementary study after the fact, when no such instructions were given before the fact	7
(7) Legitimate questions	3
(8) Do not understand	2
(9) Questions omitted by the asker from the numbered list . .	1
(10) Calling attention to mistakes	1
Total	243

NOTE. — Two questions in Mr. Mitchel's letter are numbered 121, and the number 174 is also similarly used twice in it. These mistakes have been corrected in listing the questions here.

¹ The pages given in parentheses at the end of each answer in this appendix refer to the page of the text of the report upon which either the question or the answer or both are based. The report was filed July 1, 1912. It is based upon an extensive study of the official records of the Board of Education for the year 1911. Figures and records for the year 1912 have been designated as such.

Any one can ask questions, but to ask questions which bear upon a particular subject is quite another matter. There are rules for that game. Both the plaintiff and the defendant in a case at law are bound to confine their evidence to the issue and the court will protect a witness in his refusal to answer incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial questions which are put to him. Just so, he who asks questions to test the value of a report must ask questions in keeping with the instructions in accordance with which the report was made. If he has specifically refused to issue written directions himself, he is assuredly bound by the written instructions of those to whom he commits the direction of the matter. And if during the course of the investigation he makes no effort to supplement these written directions by verbal counsel or advice and at no time does so, he cannot, having neglected to issue orders before the fact, hope to issue them after the fact and insist that the report shall contain the subject-matter of his desires after having failed to indicate such desires until after the report was made.

If he is reasonable he will, too, in his questions take some account of the limits of time under which the work was performed and not ask to be shown that a body of work which would require a year has been done in three months. If he wants to know about the scope and methods of the work which has been undertaken he will, if he is sincere, and genuinely concerned about it, make an effort to talk it over with the person who has performed it.

The directions under which the foregoing report was made were issued to me by Professor Paul H. Hanus, whom the Committee on School Inquiry of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York placed in charge of the educational aspects of the school inquiry. All negotiations as to my part of the work were conducted by him. I was never at any time asked to see any one else during the course of my study, nor have I seen any member of the committee up to this time. The text of Professor Hanus' instructions to me was as follows: "The work which I should like to assign to you is an investigation into the organization, methods, and records of the Board of Education, or so much of this work as it is possible for you to do. What I am particularly anxious to ascertain is, whether the conception of its functions which the Board of Education has is clearly defined; whether that conception is justified; and whether the organization and methods of the board tend toward efficiency. Naturally, whatever recommendations as to the function, organization, and methods we might make should be based on some such inquiry as I have indicated."

There are certain things that I was not directed to do by these instructions, and one great thing that I was directed to do. I was distinctly not directed to find out and report how the Board of

Estimate conducts the details of its business, nor what manner of intention, laudable or otherwise, moves its members in the various acts which they perform; but as the results of its action directly and immediately condition the activities of the Board of Education and the schools, the results of its action naturally came in for a good deal of attention. I was not directed to work out the natural history of specific and selected portions of the business which the Board of Education has transacted, whether with or without the approval of the Board of Estimate. I was not directed to make a study of this or that committee of the Board of Education and prepare a special report upon how it performs its work in detail, for as the time was limited, the persistent following up of the work of any single committee would have taken me away from the larger task which I was instructed to perform. I was not directed to go out into the schools to find out by direct observation there what results seem to attend the activities of the Board of Education. I was not directed to make an audit of the books of the Board of Education, since this study is but one of a series of related studies, each on a special aspect of the school work; neither was I instructed to present all my studies in the form of tabulations or to collect and transcribe a prescribed number of passages from the minutes of the board to accompany every fact which I might discover and record concerning the conditions which obtain in the board. Such a work of making tables for others to interpret and of transcribing extracts for others to base judgments upon belongs rather to a clerk than to one who is employed because his familiarity with the work which he is engaged to scrutinize has given him standards by which to measure the adequacy of its performance, and enabled him to select the features of it which have a determining significance and to make judgments which are sound regarding it.

I have not and am not prepared to undertake to collect evidence without interpreting it, or to report the names of the men who furnished the facts which I incorporated into the report. If a judicial investigation is ordered in which sworn evidence is taken and witnesses are protected by the court, I hold myself ready to assist by divulging all the sources of information which were opened to me.

These things my instructions did not cover. The one thing which they directed me to do was to study and report upon the scheme of administrative machinery by which New York City attempts to conduct its immense public school system. They defined a morphological study, not a historical one, and wherever documents have been used they have been used solely for the purpose of explaining how things are being done which are now being done. What the instructions called for and what the report attempts to set forth, then, is a cross-section of the system of administrative devices by which the public schools are

conducted. It attempts to set forth exhaustively what the plan of school administration is, with just enough of how the administrative machinery works to determine whether or not it is sufficient for the undertaking and wherein it can be improved and made more adequate than it now is. The report is in no sense a report upon how the Board of Estimate and the Board of Education have conducted the details of the school business through a period of months or of years.

Again, any report, any book, or any article, on any subject whatever, since it is a whole of connected parts, must be read as a whole. Just as certainly as a brick in the carrier's hod has a different significance from the same brick laid up in the wall and carrying its share of the strain of the building, so is a sentence, which is a definite part of a paragraph or a chapter, when taken out of its context and made to stand alone. The sentences of a report are not fairly dealt with when they are dislocated and tested separately. This report was not read as a whole. It was read line by line, perhaps, but not line with line.

The two requests addressed to me by the Committee on School Inquiry for such facts and evidence as I might have in support of the allegations and conclusions to which exception was taken were as follows, both requests being signed by the chairman of the committee, Mr. John Purroy Mitchel. Please note their lack of relation to the subject of my instructions and the failure of the man who made them to read the report or to quote it exactly. My answers follow in each case.

July 26, 1912.

MY DEAR DR. MOORE:

I have read a summary of your report on the Board of Education and Local School Boards. I do not know how exhaustive the investigation was upon which your report is based. In order that I may understand its scope, will you kindly give me information upon the following points:

1. Did you attend any meetings of the committees of the Board of Education not noted in your memoranda of time spent in work done for the Committee on School Inquiry? If so, what committees?

Answer. It is very likely that I did. My record is not complete. But what is the purport of this question? The investigation at this point was an effort to discover how the committee work is performed. This was done by attending a considerable number of committee meetings until I was familiar with their methods of procedure and then reading and analyzing the typewritten and printed records of the meetings of each one of the committees for one year. One sees the committee best in its minutes if his

investigation is not a personal one or an effort to follow specific items of business from their initiation to their conclusion, but is instead an attempt to find out what the committee does, how it does it, and what hindrances it meets in the doing of it.

School board committees and their work are not new to me, as I attended most of the meetings of all the committees of a board of education for more than four years.

2. Did you make a study to ascertain how much time in hours and minutes each of the committees of the Board of Education has given in consideration of the budget estimates of that department for each of the years 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911? If so, how much time was actually given by each committee in each year?

Answer. I did not. Such an inquiry I have never at any time been directed to make. So far as I know there is no means of determining how many minutes a committee nominally gives to any matter save by being present at its meeting with a stop watch in one's hand, and making a written entry at once from the reading of the watch. Such an investigation might tell how many minutes the committee nominally spends on a given matter. It would not tell at all how many minutes of actual thought the committee gave to the matter. Psychologists have no means as yet by which to solve so intricate a problem.

3. Did you ascertain how long the Board of Education itself, sitting as a board, considered the annual budgetary estimates of the Department of Education for each of the years 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911?

Answer. I did not. Again I know of no practical means of doing this.

4. Did you read the minutes of the Board of Education budgetary hearings before the Budget Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment in October, 1910, and in 1911?

Answer. I did not; but I had a very thorough account of the hearing in October, 1911, from a member of this investigating staff who was present at and took part in it. From his account I judged that little that was of profit to me in my investigation took place there. I am confirmed in the wisdom of my course by the fact that my investigation had nothing to do with the *making of the budget*, but only with the making of the *estimates* by the Board of Education and with the effect of the budget, after it was finally made, upon the educational work which the board is endeavoring to carry on. The estimates are prepared by the Board of Education and submitted in printed form. The dis-

cussion of them at the budgetary hearing has little or nothing to do with the making of the estimates. How budgets are made I neither was directed to study, nor studied, nor reported upon.

5. Did you make a study of the minutes of the Board of Education and of its committees and of the minutes of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and its committees, to ascertain whether or not it is difficult for the Board of Education to secure supplementary appropriations, such as revenue bonds, between budget periods?

Answer. I did make such a study of the minutes of the Board of Education and of its committees. On the whole it is very difficult and in some cases impossible, as the application for such supplementary appropriations is sometimes refused altogether and the process is always a tedious one, and one which naturally is not undertaken until there is no other way out of the difficulty. The relief almost always comes too late not to bring about a positive deterioration in the service. Quite apart from this, however, the issuing of bonds to pay running expenses is hardly sound financiering. A receiver would most likely be asked for for a private corporation which pursued that policy for any length of time.

6. Did you consult with any member of the Budget Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment concerning the making of the budget of the City of New York, and particularly concerning the budget of the Board of Education? If so, with whom and to what extent?

Answer. I did not, for the reason that my instructions did not call for a study of how budgets are made. My only connection with them was to find out what their effect was upon the work of the Board of Education after they had been made. It would have been presumptuous for me to report to the Board of Estimate how it goes about its work. That is well known to all its members. What is not known to them is what effect the results of their work have. My instructions confined me to this.

7. Did you consult with the examiner of the Department of Finance, Mrs. Matilda Coffin Ford, in matters pertaining to the public schools, concerning the making of the Board of Education's budget and the accuracy of the allowances made by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to the Board of Education?

Answer. I did not, for the reason stated above, that I took the budget as a result. I am at a loss to know how the allowances can be "accurate" when they neither meet the estimates nor do the work which they were appropriated to maintain.

Surely the "accuracy" which determines them so inexactly must be a form of academical accuracy based upon inexact or wrong theory.

8. Did you consult with the Secretary of the Borough of Manhattan, who represents the President of the borough, in matters relating to the public schools?

Answer. I did not, as the Secretary of the Borough has no official relation to the schools. What is the legal responsibility of the President of the Borough of Manhattan for the public schools? He appoints members of local school boards for his borough. All I know of him leads me to believe that he appoints good ones. Into matters of the appointment and personnel of local school boards and the general school board I did not go. It was quite beyond the limits of my instructions.

9. Did you consult with the examiners in my office who deal with the estimates and interim requests of the Department of Education?

Answer. I did not. As you did not find it necessary to see me from the time of my appointment until my report was made, I did not find it necessary to see them. As I was not investigating your office, but took its work as a given result whose consequences I was employed to inquire into and report upon, it seemed to me, and still seems to me, that my detail did not call for any consultation with any one in your office save your chief in charge of the educational aspects of the school inquiry, who directed me in all my work.

10. Did you read the correspondence between the Chairman of the Committee on School Inquiry and the President of the Board of Education dealing with the plan, scope, and method of the school inquiry?

Answer. I did not. I did not have time to go on a general dredging expedition of that sort. My orders were given me by your representative who nominated me to you and after my appointment gave me the instructions which governed my detail. In addition I have carefully examined the resolution of October, 1910, by which the committee was created and under which it is acting. I have talked with the President of the Board of Education a number of times about this investigation, but never gathered from him that you were leaving it to his office to direct me.

11. Did you read the correspondence between the Chairman of the Vacant Lands Committee of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund

248 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

and the President of the Board of Education dealing with the vacant and unused properties held by the Board of Education?

Answer. As much of this correspondence as affected the work of the committees of the Board of Education and of the board itself, I read. As I was not detailed to make a report on unused lands, which is a subject already perhaps sufficiently exploited, but upon the methods which are now in use by the Board of Education in administering the schools, I did not single out this subject as one requiring an undue measure of attention. The selection of school sites as carried on at present is, I believe, adequately treated in my report.

12. Did you consult the correspondence between the different members of the Budget Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the President and other members of the Board of Education dealing with the budget estimates of the Board of Education?

Answer. Yes.

13. Did you read the minutes of the hearing of the Committee on School Inquiry on non-promotion and retardation where members of the Board of Education and its staff were heard?

Answer. No. The investigation of non-promotion and retardation was assigned to another member of Professor Hanus' staff.

14. Did you read the minutes of the hearing held by the Committee on School Inquiry on methods and organization of the office of the City Superintendent and Associate Superintendents?

Answer. No. For the reason that the investigation of methods and organization of the office of the City Superintendent and the Associate Superintendents was assigned by Professor Hanus to another member of his staff.

15. Did you read the minutes of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund dealing with the requests of the Board of Education for approval of leases of property for school purposes for the years 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912?

Answer. No. First, because I was not investigating the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund; and second, because the Charter, Section 1066, says that the Board of Education "shall have power to lease property required for the purpose of furnishing school accommodations and to prepare and execute leases therefor," and the present plan of committing this work to the Commissioners

of the Sinking Fund is, as I have shown in the report, plainly illegal and very detrimental to the schools.

16. Did you consult with the Appraiser of Real Estate of the Department of Finance, and did you study the records of his office to ascertain how much his office has saved in the purchase of school sites since lump sum appropriations for such sites have been discontinued and since his office has been passing directly upon proposed leases of the Department of Education?

Answer. I did not. The school service does not exist to save money, but to expend it wisely and according to law for public educational purposes. The present method does not lead to wise expenditure for purposes of education.

17. Did you consult with the chief of the Bureau of Municipal Investigation and Statistics and with the chief Auditor of Accounts of the Department of Finance in order to secure their statement on the good results flowing from segregated allowances of funds in the Corporate Stock Budget and in the Annual Expense Budget in the Department of Education?

Answer. I did not. I cannot consider that "good results" can flow from conditions which impede the work of public education so greatly and which take away from the Board of Education both its general law and its charter-given right and duty to administer all moneys appropriated or available for educational purposes in the City of New York. (Section 1060.) Moreover, the charter expressly directs the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the Board of Aldermen "to indicate in the budget in raising the Special School Fund the respective amounts thereof which shall be available for use in the several boroughs." Surely these bodies are under the law and are not a law unto themselves.

18. Did you confer with the Municipal Art Commission about time consumed in giving its approval to plans for school buildings and about the necessity for consideration of such plans?

Answer. I did not. I have, however, figures in my possession which show the exact number of days consumed through a period of weeks in this process. About the "necessity" for such consideration of plans on the part of the Municipal Art Commission, I am convinced that it is desirable, provided first that it is legal; but Section 1973 of the charter declares that "all plans for new school buildings, and for structural additions to school buildings, and for structural changes in old buildings, shall be passed upon,

250 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

and approved by the Superintendent of School Buildings, who shall submit such plans to the Board of Education whose action thereon shall be final."

QUESTIONS ASKED BY MR. MITCHEL IN A LETTER OF AUGUST 19.

1. Omitted by the asker of the questions.

2. Would you still say that the Board of Aldermen reduces school budgets in face of the fact that only once in twelve years it had done so?

Answer. Yes, if I had ever said so, since the Board of Aldermen has just done so a second time. What I did state was the legal routine which must be observed and what is involved in it. Moreover, the text of the report in your hands before your letter was sent read "The Board of Aldermen then *may* reduce them." (See p. 4.)

3. Please indicate where you want the two tables to go and if the footnote is needed.

Answer. The introduction of this seemingly innocent inquiry has the appearance of editorial solicitude. The writer of the report was responsible for this and the maker of the question was not. (See pp. 4 and 5.)

4. Please list definitely the legal functions of the Board of Education which have not been clearly determined, and those others which have not been enforced.

Answer. This is a matter for the courts. The report from which you made the questions lists definitely among the functions of the Board of Education which have not been clearly enough determined to be lived up to, the requirement of the general law that the business of public education shall be divorced from all other municipal interests or business. Also the charter provision, Section 1060, "The Board of Education shall have power to administer and shall administer all moneys appropriated or available for educational purposes in the City of New York." Also Section 1061, "There shall be in the City of New York as constituted by this act, a board of education which shall have the management and control of the public schools and the public school system of the City, subject only to the general statutes of the State relating to public schools and public school instruction and

to the provisions of this act." Also Section 1062, "For the purposes of this chapter the Board of Education of the City of New York shall possess the powers and privileges of a corporation." Among the very clear provisions of the charter which have not been lived up to are the directions (1060) that "the General School Fund shall be raised in bulk"; "It shall be the duty of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and of the Board of Aldermen to indicate in the budget in raising the Special School Fund the respective amounts thereof which shall be available for use in the several boroughs"; "the Board of Education shall have power to lease property required for the purpose of furnishing school accommodations and to prepare and execute leases therefor" (1066); "The Board of Education shall have power, subject to the provisions of law and of this act, to enact by-laws, rules and regulations for the proper execution of all duties devolved upon the board," etc. (1068); "All plans for new school buildings, for additions to school buildings and for structural changes in old buildings, shall be passed upon, and must be approved by the superintendent of school buildings, who shall submit such plans to the Board of Education, whose action thereon shall be final" (1073); "The Board of Education shall provide for the purchase of all books, apparatus, stationery, and all other things necessary and expedient to enable the schools of the City to be properly and successfully conducted" (1075). (See pp. 23-26.)

5. Can you furnish any basis for the statement not supported in this present copy that the "fiscal authorities of the city seem to hold that the school system is in all respects a subordinate department of the city government"?

Answer. This question begs the question, as full evidence is supplied in the report. See particularly Judge Gaynor's decision and the Gunnison decision as to the sense in which the school department is a city department. See also the preamble which the Board of Estimate uses in making the annual budget, in which it treats the school department just as any other city department. There is nothing in the treatment of the Board of Education by the fiscal authorities, in their attempted requirements as to uniformity of accounting, in their resolutions concerning the approval of building plans, supply furnishing, the making of appropriations, and the official investigating of the work of the schools, which recognizes the fact that the school system is not on a parity with other city departments. As long as the fiscal authorities assume to tell the Board of Education what, when, and how it may do, they effectually take away from the board its law-given right to manage and control the public schools. (See p. 23.)

252 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

6. Please support with facts the statement that the schools have been almost completely annexed to the City Hall.

Answer. The statement is abundantly supported with documentary facts in the report. The constitution of the state and its general and special laws have been set aside by executive orders. A rankly illegal system of administration has usurped the place of the lawful one. To such an extent is this true, that the Foley bill which the legislature refused to pass seems to have been drafted for the purpose of providing legal warrant for a scheme of school administration which has come into existence and obtains without legal warrant to support it. (See p. 23.)

7. Please indicate what, if any delay, or what, if any injury, resulted from the alleged encroachment by the Board of Estimate.

Answer. It is self-evident that if the law prescribes a process with two steps and an executive order sets it aside and substitutes a routine of twelve steps, since it takes longer to take twelve steps than to take two, very great delay is inevitable and every such delay spells injury, since the work in hand is pressing.

The table on pp. 254-257 shows the delays involved in the work of one department for a few weeks by the arbitrary setting aside of the charter provision that the action of the Board of Education in adopting building plans shall be *final*. (See pp. 23-41.)

8. Please supplement your statement about the Board of Estimate's recommendation to the Board of Education *re* budgets for 1911-12, with a statement showing how far the Board of Education regarded these recommendations or observed its promises.

Answer. The action of the Board of Estimate attempted to be much more compelling than a mere "recommendation." The resolution creating the General School Fund for 1911 reads thus: "The above allowance for the General School Fund for the year 1911 is \$1,740,143.43 in excess of the product of the three-mill tax. This extra allowance is made under the terms and conditions that the recommendations made by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment as to the apportionment of the entire fund among the various purposes of the General School Fund expenditure will be followed, said extra allowance being conditional upon the acceptance of the segregation indicated below." As the charter, Section 1060, says "The General School Fund shall be raised in bulk, and for the city at large," this action on the part of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment was plainly an effort to set the charter aside. The thing was illegal and the Board of Education had no other

course but to refuse to be bound by it. This paragraph is omitted from the budget for the Board of Education for 1913 as adopted by the Board of Estimate and printed in the *City Record* of November 12, 1912. In its place the following phrase is substituted: "Recommended apportionment of General School Fund," but code numbers are given to the segregations thus "recommended" and the fund is to that extent not raised *in bulk*. (See p. 25.)

9. Can you supply evidence to show that the functional budget for the Special Fund has "paralyzed the public business"?

Answer. See the routine which Board of Education follows, pages 6 and 7. The text of the report does not say that the functional budget for the Special Fund has "paralyzed the public business." It reads: "Quite apart from the legal warrant for such procedure, it creates a circumlocution device for school administration which tends to paralyze the public business and almost to defeat the objects for which the Board of Education was created." There are quantities of evidence scattered through the minutes of the Board of Education and of its committees that this is so. (See p. 25.)

10. How many instances support your statement that the general staff of the Board of Education has been reduced "to the routine work of continually requesting the Board of Estimate to transfer money," etc.? Please cite them.

Answer. This is not my statement. It is: "It tends to reduce the administration of the schools and the energy of the general staff, in large part to the routine work of continually requesting the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to transfer money from one fund to another, in order to meet the readjustments required in the school service." The minutes are full of this thing, and if one takes into account the energy which must be consumed in making ends meet which will not finally meet and then in hunting for some other way to make them meet, the truth of this statement will be self-evident. (See p. 25.)

11. Please illustrate by figures, dates, or facts, your statement that aldermanic control over salaries and grades prevents keeping the schools clean, hinders necessary work or necessitates needless routine.

Answer. Here again the text of the report is distorted. It reads: "There is pressing need for an immediate revision of the charter at this point, as the present provision prevents the keeping of the schools clean, hinders the necessary work in the school offices, and

DATA AS TO CERTAIN STEPS IN THE PREPARATION
BUILDINGS AND

School	Location	Art Commission			
		Preliminary Filed App'd		Final Filed App'd	
Boys' H. S.	Marcy & Putnam Avs. B'k. Const. Heating and Ventilating Electric Furniture		Apr. 26, 1909	Dec. 6, 1909	Jan. 18, 1910
W. I. H. S.	15 & 16 Sts. & Irving Pl. Man. Const. Heating and Ventilating Electric Furniture	May 9, 1910	May 9, 1910	June 30, 1910	July 5, 1910
168	Throop Av. Bartlett & Whipple St. B'k. Const. Heating and Ventilating Electric Furniture	Aug. 4, 1910	Sept. 13, '10	Sept. 7, 1910	Oct. 11, 1910
171	Ridgewood Av. Lincoln & Nichols Av. B'k. Const. Heating and Ventilating Electric Furniture	Sept. 7, 1910	Sept. 13, '10	Oct. 10, 1910	Oct. 11, 1910
47	Randolph, St. Lawrence & Hammond Avs. B'k. Const. Heating and Ventilating Electric Furniture	Nov. 14, '10	Nov. 15, '10	Jan. 6, 1911	Jan. 10, 1911
40	Pacific & Union Hull Sts., Q. Const. Heating and Ventilating Electric	Nov. 11, '10	Nov. 13, '10	Jan. 5, 1911	Jan. 10, 1911

§ Indicates approval not required at that time, or, as in the

OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR NEW SCHOOL
THEIR EQUIPMENT

Education		Fire Dep't		Building Dep't		Highways Dep't	
Bldg. Com. App'd	Bd. Ed. App'd	Filed	App'd	Filed	App'd	Filed	App'd
Dec. 13, 1909	Dec. 22, 1909	§		Dec. 17, 1909	Jan. 10, 1910	§	
June 20, 1910	June 22, 1910	§		Aug. 6, 1910	Sept. 13, '10	§	
Sept. 26, 1910	Sept. 28, '10	§		Nov. 1, 1910	Nov. 14, '10	§	
Oct. 31, 1910	Nov. 9, 1910	§		Nov. 15, '10	Dec. 10, 1910	§	
Jan. 9, 1911	Jan. 11, 1911	§		Dec. 30, 1910	Jan. 24, 1911	§	
Jan. 30, 1911	Feb. 6, 1911	§		Mar. 2, 1911	March 13, '11	§	

Dep't of Highways, that no permit was necessary.

256 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

DATA AS TO CERTAIN STEPS IN THE PREPARATION BUILDINGS AND

Dep't W. S. G. & El.		Finance Department		Specifications	
Filed	Approved	Filed	Approved	Ms. Copy Sent	Sent for Final
§ July 15, '11	Aug. 18, '11	§ Jan. 11, '12 June 27, '11 Oct. 9, '11 Aug. 30, '11 Apr. 23, '12 Oct. 18, '11 Dec. 26, '11	Feb. 19, '12 July 31, '11 Dec. 6, '11 Oct. 17, '11 June 1, '12 Dec. 5, '11 Mar. 21, '12	Dec. 8, '09 June 8, '11 July 1, '11 Mar. 28, '12 Sept. 23, '11	Dec. 22, '09 June 20, '11 Aug. 21, '11 Apr. 15, '12 Oct. 11, '11
§ It. III Aug. 15, '11 June 17, '11	and IV Sept. 15, '11 June 28, '11	§ Sept. 5, '11 Aug. 12, '11 June 27, '11 Nov. 22, '11	Oct. 7, '11 Sept. 15, '11 July 31, '11 Dec. 29, '11	Aug. 18, '10 July 24, '11 June 6, '11 Oct. 23, '11	Sept. 6, '10 Aug. 8, '11 June 28, '11 Nov. 3, '11
§ May 26, '11	June 15, '11	§ Apr. 8, '11 June 30, '11 Jan. 15, '12	Dec. 9, '10 Apr. 26, '11 July 31, '11 Mar. 21, '12	Sept. 19, '10 Mar. 22, '11 May 18, '11 Dec. 22, '11	Oct. 3, '10 Mar. 30, '11 June 20, '11 Jan. 10, '12
§ May 8, '11	May 15, '11	§ May 12, '11 May 29, '11 Nov. 21, '11	June 2, '11 June 19, '11 Mar. 21, '12	Oct. 25, '10 Apr. 24, '11 Apr. 27, '11 Sept. 27, '11	Nov. 4, '10 May 8, '11 May 16, '11 Oct. 11, '11
Feb. 28, '11	Mar. 23, '11	Feb. 6, '11 Mar. 25, '12 Nov. 20, '11	Apr. 7, '11 Apr. 21, '12 Mar. 21, '12	Jan. 12, '11 Nov. 6, '11 Nov. 25, '11 Mar. 19, '12	Jan. 30, '11 Nov. 14, '11 Jan. 2, '12 Apr. 19, '12
Dec. 8, '11	Dec. 29, '11	Jan. 22, '12 May 2, '12	Mar. 21, '12 June 8, '12		
Feb. 28, '11	Mar. 23, '11	Feb. 6, '11 Dec. 18, '11 Oct. 9, '11 Jan. 2, '12 Nov. 27, '11 Apr. 1, '12 Feb. 27, '12 Aug. 8, '12	Apr. 21, '11 Jan. 18, '12 Nov. 25, '11 Mar. 21, '12 Jan. 18, '12 June 8, '12 Mar. 29, '12 Sept. 18, '12	Jan. 11, '11 Sept. 29, '11 Oct. 2, '11 Feb. 13, '12	Jan. 28, '11 Oct. 3, '11 Nov. 1, '11 Feb. 21, '12

§ Indicates approval not required at that time, or, as in the

OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR NEW SCHOOL
THEIR EQUIPMENT

Specifications Manuscript	Bids Opened	Contract	App'd Finance Dep't as to Financial Ability
Pt'd		App'd Bd. of Ed.	
Dec. 31, 1909	Adv. (Jan. 4 '10. See note) June 27, 1910	July 13, 1910	Aug. 26, 1910
June 26, 1911	July 31, 1911	Aug. 9, 1911	Sept. 11, 1911
Aug. 24, 1911	Oct. 2, 1911	Nov. 29, 1911	Dec. 15, 1911
April 19, 1912	June 10, 1912	Dec. 13, 1911	Jan. 10, 1912
Oct. 16, 1911	Dec. 11, 1911		
Sept. 13, 1910	Oct. 10, 1910	Oct. 13, 1910	Nov. 29, 1910
Aug. 12, 1911	Sept. 5, 1911	Sept. 13, 1911	Oct. 25, 1911
July 5, 1911	July 31, 1911		Oct. 9, 1911
Nov. 14, 1911	Aug. 21, 1911	Sept. 13, 1911	Jan. 30, 1912
	Jan. 8, 1912	Jan. 10, 1912	
Oct. 7, 1910	Nov. 14, 1910	Nov. 23, 1910	Jan. 4, 1911
April 5, 1911	May 8, 1911	May 10, 1911	June 5, 1911
June 26, 1911	July 31, 1911	Aug. 9, 1911	Sept. 5, 1911
Jan. 15, 1911	Mar. 25, 1912	Mar. 27, 1912	May 3, 1912
Nov. 11, 1911	Nov. 28, 1910	Dec. 14, 1910	Dec. 31, 1910
May 12, 1911	June 12, 1911	June 14, 1911	July 24, 1911
May 22, 1911	June 26, 1911	June 28, 1911	July 29, 1911
Oct. 16, 1911	Mar. 25, 1912	Mar. 27, 1912	May 3, 1912
Feb. 4, 1911	April 17, 1911	April 26, 1911	May 22, 1911
Nov. 17, 1912	Mar. 25, 1912	Apr. 24, 1912	May 8, 1912
Jan. 5, 1912	Mar. 25, 1912	Mar. 27, 1912	May 3, 1912
April 25, 1911	June 17, 1912	June 26, 1912	July 23, 1912
Feb. 2, 1911	May 1, 1911	May 10, 1911	June 19, 1911
Oct. 5, 1911	Dec. 18, 1911		
	Jan. 22, 1912	Jan. 24, 1912	Feb. 13, 1912
Nov. 9, 1911	Jan. 2, 1912	Mar. 27, 1912	May 13, 1912
	Jan. 22, 1912	Jan. 24, 1912	Feb. 21, 1912
Feb. 27, 1911	April 1, 1912	April 10, 1912	May 13, 1912

Dep't of Highways, that no permit was necessary.

has, through the needless routine which it necessitates, cost the city something like a hundred thousand dollars through mistakes already made in fixing the salaries in the general offices of one department, as will be pointed out in Section XII of this report." (See p. 26.) For full and complete evidence of these things read the chapter on the Care of Buildings, and the chapter on the Offices of the Board of Education,

12. Would you wish to insert any qualifications necessary to remove a seeming lack of compatibility between assertions by you and your colleagues as to lack of efficiency in organization, supplies, etc., and your diagnosis of difficulties?

Answer. As I am the only person detailed by Professor Hanus to investigate the organization and work of the Board of Education, I have no desire to change the report.

13. Will you indicate more clearly just where the confusion is about the relations of the fiscal department and the Board of Education?

Answer. The confusion is as to their functions, as stated in the report. (See p. 27.)

14. Will you furnish evidence, now lacking, that the various branches of the city government were in constant struggle with the Board of Education?

Answer. The struggle is "as to what the law is and what must and must not be done." The evidence is in the report. (See p. 27.)

15. Please indicate in your list of steps taken (a) those which are taken within the Board of Education; (b) those which are not now taken but would be necessary if the fire department, health department, etc., did not inspect; (c) those steps which now accomplish no purpose and could be entirely dropped out. Can you give the facts for any one site showing the time required for each of these steps?

Answer. The facts are as reported. A classification can be made from them. The procedure should conform to law. (See pp. 28-30.)

16. Is the 1906 illustration typical? Did the Sinking Fund Commission hope to save money, or was it just meddling? Could you add to it a 1911 or 1912 illustration?

Answer. The 1906 illustration is typical of the difficulties which arise. There is no 1911 or 1912 illustration, because the Board of Education weakly yielded some years ago. I am at a loss to know what could have prompted them to set aside the law. (See pp. 33-41.)

17. When here and elsewhere you say that steps seem to be of doubtful legal warrant, have you sought legal advice? Whom did you consult?

Answer. I have, and that fact is noted in the report, together with the name of the office from which I had it. (See pp. 8 and 9.)

18. You make the criticism that the present method "can hardly be improved upon as a means of defeating the ends for which a school system exists." Would you include those deficiencies which your colleagues attribute to the defective use of present charter powers by the Board of Education?

Answer. My statement is sufficiently clear. (See p. 40.)

19. Can you cite illustrations of defects or delays or extravagances or other inefficiencies for which "responsibility can never possibly be fastened upon the man who made them"?

Answer. The \$100,000 mistake in fixing salaries (p. 153). The illegal scheme of administration which now obtains. Other examples of delays and inefficiencies are given throughout the report. (See pp. 40 and 152.)

20. In stating that initiative is "crushed out by the hopelessness which comes from thinking of the number of steps which must be taken," etc., do you wish to refer only to inter-departmental relations, or do you include matters over which the Board of Education has complete control?

Answer. Both. (See p. 40.)

21. Will you cite instances of constant change in the interpretation of application of laws, ordinances, etc., issuance of new regulations and interpretations which now "produce a confusion and a weariness in administration which deadens it"?

Answer. Read the report as a whole, and the particular sentence on which the above is based as a whole. Changes in interpretation have taken place in the matter of fixing the pay of janitors, in the matter of auditing, in the matter of controlling funds as, for example, the general fund, in methods of inspecting, in the regulations governing allowances for repair work, in the requirements laid down for the making of estimates, etc., etc. (See pp. 40-42.)

22. Please give illustration with dates and results of attempts made by the Board of Aldermen to locate schools, rent buildings, establish high schools, appoint teachers, and fix the course of study. Will you

cite instances where they have done more than direct a respectful request to the Board of Education?

Answer. The report refers the reader to the minutes of the Board of Education for 1910 and 1911 for illustrations. The results of their attempts are not material. What is material is that without the color of law to warrant them in doing so, this board has repeatedly officially interfered in the school business. On December 6, 1910, the Board of Aldermen, by resolution, conveyed to the Board of Education "its earnest protest" against a rumored elimination of German and French from the curriculum of the public schools, the consideration of the expediency of so doing having been forced upon the Board of Education by an arbitrary cut in its estimates by the fiscal authorities of the city. This is a case where the Board of Education caught it both going and coming.

On December 13th, 1910, the Board of Aldermen adopted a resolution requesting the Board of Education "to have all school books and other matter printed in union printing shops in Greater New York, and not in other cities as is now being done."

On the 20th of December, 1910, the Board of Aldermen adopted a resolution "that the Board of Aldermen request and they do hereby request the Board of Education to fill vacancies for men teachers as soon as such vacancies occur, and that all vacancies for men that now exist be filled by the appointment of men teachers when the next appointments are made."

On June 21st, a resolution with a long preamble was adopted by them "recommending that the proper authorities hire" a certain designated building in the Bronx for high school purposes.

On November 22d, 1910, the Board of Aldermen requests the Board of Education to instruct their architect to ascertain what the cost of an annex to Public School 12, Westchester, would be and "report to this Board so that action toward securing funds for the erection of a new building may be taken."

On February 15th, 1910, the Board of Estimate and the Board of Education are requested to establish a high school for boys and girls in the Bay Ridge section of the Borough of Brooklyn.

Instances of official interference might be extended; they make a long list. Such official requests are not respectful, for they actually presume that the Board of Education shall remember that the Board of Aldermen has power to reduce the budget. They are issued as by a superior body to an inferior and dependent body, although Section 43 of the charter, which enumerates the powers of the Board of Aldermen, expressly declares that "nothing in this section shall be construed to impair the powers conferred by this act upon the department of education." (See p. 42.)

23. If the Board of Education disregards the segregation made by the Board of Estimate in the general fund, and if the Board of Estimate does not refuse to make the transfer in the Special School Fund requested by the Board of Education, would you say that the Board of Estimate has up to date rendered the Board of Education a mere rubber stamp?

Answer. The hypothesis is contrary to fact. Also, see the exact wording of the passage of the report upon which it pretends to be based. (See p. 43.)

24. Can you cite any instance where the Board of Estimate has decided and determined what subjects shall be taught and what supplies shall be furnished?

Answer. The text of the report states that "in effect" the Board of Estimate and Apportionment "administers the school affairs of the city, deciding and determining what subjects shall be taught." There are, however, instances where it has done so. The sum of \$707,071.89 was asked in the estimates for 1912 for special branches. The Board of Estimate segregated the General School Fund and set apart \$500,000 for special branches. Teachers in service would have had to be dismissed and some of the classes of the year before abandoned if the Board of Education had not resisted this illegal assumption of authority. Requests for money in the same estimates for the extension of school activities, as workshops, kitchens, kindergartens, science rooms, and for the equipment of the same were cut out. No new pianos were allowed, which, in effect, meant no new kindergartens for that year. Thus manual training, domestic science, laboratory science, and kindergarten instruction were denied to perhaps thousands of children. In this way the Board of Estimate arbitrarily makes the course of study for them. (See p. 42.)

25. If, in spite of the restrictions mentioned by you, the Board of Education is proved to have wasted money voted for supplies or intended for repairs, would you hold the Board of Estimate responsible for these results?

Answer. Section 1060 of the charter says that "the Board of Education shall have power to administer and shall administer all moneys appropriated or available for educational purposes in the City of New York." It is responsible for what it does. The Board of Estimate is responsible for whatever interference with this specific and undoubted right of the Board of Education it attempts. To earmark funds for specific uses is one such interference. (See p. 42.)

26. Can you furnish an illustration of interference which will relate to the Board of Education instead of the one given by you which relates to the Normal College? Did you consult the correspondence which preceded the letter to the Corporation Counsel which you quote? Can you furnish a list of several such interferences?

Answer. Section 1143 of the charter reads, "The said Board of Education, as trustees of said college, shall continue to furnish through the Normal College of the City of New York the benefit of education gratuitously to girls who have been pupils in the common schools," etc. This is only an ex-officio relation of the Board of Education. Any interference with them in it is still an interference with their functions. The correspondence which led up to the letter does not invalidate the letter or the Corporation Counsel's opinion. Another interference of similar nature is the resolution of the Board of Estimate of January 10th, 1909, "That this Board do and it does hereby establish a commission with power to investigate the justice, economy, and adequacy of the present and proposed schedules of salaries for the payment of teachers of the Department of Education," etc. (See pp. 43-44.)

27. Please indicate what suggestions the Board of Estimate has ever made as to the educational records which should be kept by the Board of Education.

Answer. No such statement is made in the report. The statement there is, "Some of its members feel called upon to suggest the kind of educational records which should be kept and to interfere with the educational economy of the system." Evidence of this can be furnished if needed. (See p. 43.)

28. Did you consult with any representative of the Board of Estimate or of the Comptroller to learn whether such representative or representatives were less "familiar with the routine of school requirements and the changing nature of school conditions than the school officials consulted"? If so, what did you find?

Answer. In the nature of the case, they cannot be so familiar, not being on the job. (See p. 46.)

29. Please cite instances of transfers "badly needed, being difficult to obtain and frequently unobtainable."

Answer. The records show a good many such instances. Lack of space forbids more than sample instances here. On March 13th, 1912, the Board of Education requested a transfer of \$2000 from the wages, Temporary Employees Evening Lecture Centers Fund,

1911, to the Salaries of Janitors Fund, 1911. Permission was refused on April 25th, 1912.

On April 12th, 1911, request was made for a transfer of \$400 from the Salaries of Janitors Fund, 1910, to the Contingencies, Truant Schools Fund, 1910. It was refused on May 4th, 1911.

On June 28th, 1911, request was made for a transfer of \$10 from the Salaries, Office of the Superintendent of Buildings Fund, 1911, to the Salaries, Office of the Superintendent of School Supplies Fund, 1911. It was refused on July 13th, 1911.

On September 20th, 1911, request was made for a transfer of \$50 from the Supplies, Truant Schools, 1909, to Contingencies, Truant Schools, 1909. It was refused December 14th, 1911.

The average time consumed in the making of a number of transfers in 1911 was eighteen days for each. The fact that such transfers were badly needed is sufficiently shown by the board undertaking so roundabout and tedious a process to get them. What is objected to is not so much their number, though that represents a harassing degree of worry which is put upon the Board of Education, but the pestiferous and annoying character of this sort of espionage over even the smallest matters in the business of the Board of Education, though the charter expressly says that "the Board of Education shall have power to administer and shall administer all moneys appropriated or available for educational purposes in the City of New York" (1060). A more effective service-defeating device than this could not well be imagined. It is illegal, it serves to complicate situations, delays the consummation of important matters, and conduces to slackness and inefficiency of administration. (See pp. 47-48.)

30. Will you indicate how the change of 2513 classes in 1911 was made less or more flexible by the Board of Estimate regulations?

Answer. The average class has about 40 pupils; $2513 \times 40 =$ a shift of 100,520 pupils within the year. Now the Board of Estimate regulations attempted to fix the amount of money which might be expended for teachers of the several kinds during the year, thus striving to take away the freedom of the Board of Education to provide teachers freely within the limits of the general appropriation. Then, too, funds must be available for the instant making ready of rooms at the moment they are needed. The funds are not available. New kindergartens, manual training, and domestic science rooms must be opened in places where they are not, because of the presence of numbers of new students, for whom the regular opportunities must be provided. Janitor service must be shifted and, since the work has increased, new rates of pay must be deter-

mined. There must be a shifting in the clerical help of principals. The supply problem is complicated, but since the supply funds are not much subdivided, adjustment there is not so difficult. (See p. 48.)

31. Did the Board of Estimate make it harder for the Board of Education to change its plans from a twelve-room to a twenty-six-room building?

Answer. Not alleged in the report. (See p. 48.)

32. Did you ascertain whether the facts which became available in November, 1911, could not have been obtained by the Board of Education in March, 1911?

Answer. Not material to my inquiry. A speculative question. (See p. 48.)

33. Did you cite the reduction in janitor services, etc., as "crippling of activities"? Did the Board of Estimate give the relief promised? In the other illustrations, did you ascertain whether there was really lack of funds for purposes mentioned? Whether funds were found for other purposes equally needy? How much was spent that year for publishing the annual fiscal report of the Board of Education?

Answer. This is administration, which according to law belongs to the Board of Education. (See p. 49.)

34. How many of the proposed expenditures listed on galleys 418FF, 419, and 420 were submitted to the Board of Estimate and denied by it?

Answer. Money was asked in the estimates and denied. This is crippling. (See pp. 50-56.)

35. Is the postponement (made by the Board of Estimate) of the increase in attendance officers' salaries explained by the fact that both the City Superintendent and the Associate Superintendents were stating at the time that a large proportion of these attendance officers were incompetent, as shown by the report of one of your colleagues in the school inquiry?

Answer. No. The Board of Education could not carry out its contracts. The supervision of its force belongs to it. (See p. 50.)

36. You criticise the Board of Estimate because funds were not available in September to take over a trade school recommended for absorption by the school system in the preceding July, when the budget of the Board of Education was compiled by it in the preceding October.

Will you indicate how an independent school system could have dealt with this question better than it was dealt with in the instance cited?

Answer. It would have had a margin for such purposes. (See p. 51.)

37. Have you noted any instances when money was voted by the Board of Estimate for workshops but not applied to such purposes and diverted by the Board of Education to other purposes?

Answer. This is administration of schools, and belongs to the Board of Education. The Board of Education controls all school funds under the law. It does not divert school money when it uses it as seems to it best.

38. Have you noted the failure of the board to use money voted by the Board of Estimate for anæmic classes?

Answer. No. I have noted a great lack of money for this purpose during the period studied.

39. Would you indicate which of these various expenses were requested in budget estimates and denied by the Board of Estimate and which, if any, of them could not have been foreseen at budget time?

Answer. More money was asked for each of these purposes and denied by the Board of Estimate. Without prophetic insight it is not possible to forecast necessary expenditures in all details. (See pp. 49-56.)

40. Will you indicate in how far the minutes of budget hearings show that such conditions as you point out were described to the Board of Estimate by the Board of Education?

Answer. The estimates are submitted in writing, not in hearings.

41. Will you indicate passages from reports of the City Superintendent of Schools or his associates and directors which give evidence that educational work is hampered?

Answer. I have done so in the report. (See pp. 50, 53, 55; and 214-215.)

42. Would it not be well to indicate, in footnote, the percentage of assessed valuation to actual valuation in 1903, giving a definite figure instead of "greater per cent of property valuations after 1903"?

Answer. I do not think this is material to the facts I bring out. (See p. 58.)

266 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

43. The committee would like you to put in a table which will show side by side the percentage increase of appropriations with the percentage increase of attendance, *i. e.*, 3.73 *vs.* 2.56; 4.68 *vs.* 1.64; 5.02 *vs.* 4.65; 6 *vs.* 3.83, etc., etc. Would you give such facts by kinds of school, — elementary, high, training, etc.?

Answer. Table given here.

APPROPRIATIONS BY BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND APPORTIONMENT—YEARS 1906 TO 1912

GENERAL SCHOOL FUND AND SPECIAL SCHOOL FUND, SHOWING PERCENTAGES OF INCREASES

GENERAL SCHOOL FUND			SPECIAL SCHOOL FUND	
Year	Appropriations by Board of Estimate and Apportionment	Per cent of Increase of Each Year Over Next Preceding Year	Appropriations by Board of Estimate and Apportionment	Per cent of Increase of Each Year Over Next Preceding Year
1906	\$18,754,238.72	\$4,618,765.72
1907	19,871,870.58	05.95	5,070,057.58	09.77
1908	21,038,075.22	05.86	5,674,888.37	11.92
1909	22,044,821.43	04.78	5,425,915.37	04.38 ²
1910	23,130,014.40	04.92	5,448,418.03	00.41
1911	23,990,655.92	03.72	5,021,658.42	07.83 ²
1912	28,421,601.04	18.46 ¹	5,435,097.10	08.23
Per cent of Increase of 1912 over 1906 (new conditions)		51.54	Per cent of Increase of 1912 over 1906	17.67
Per cent of Increase of 1912 over 1906 (old conditions)		31.01

¹ Includes increase due to equal pay law. Under the conditions existing prior to the passage of said law, the increase would be but 02.42.

² Decrease.

ATTENDANCE

SHOWING PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH YEAR OVER NEXT PRECEDING YEAR. DAILY AVERAGE IN THOUSANDS, ALL BOROUGHs

Day Ele- mentary Schools	Training Schools	Evening High Schools	Voca- tional Schools	Day High Schools	Evening Elemen- tary Schools	Lectures
4.21	10.47	6.20	6.98	4.55	9.11 ¹
5.20	16.47	25.35	19.39	1.25	16.75
1.92	15.48	4.06 ¹	15.70	16.47 ¹	18.63 ¹
1.50	02.67	7.83	531.15	10.57	4.48	8.20 ¹
4.40	05.25 ¹	11.01	58.18	7.56	10.25	2.18

¹ Indicates per cent of decrease.

ATTENDANCE — *continued*

SHOWING PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OF EACH YEAR OVER NEXT PRECEDING YEAR. DAILY AVERAGE IN THOUSANDS, ALL BOROUGHs

Truant Schools	Vacation Schools	Evening Roof Play- grounds	Vacation Baths	Evening Recreation Centers	Vacation Play- grounds	Nautical School
7.30 ¹	00.49 ¹	8.05	38.93	2.27 ¹	16.66	10.25
17.57	9.40 ¹	12.48 ¹	5.47	16.79	8.71	11.63
85.05	14.10	26.85 ¹	14.47 ¹	8.39	68.79	11.46
5.85	11.18	15.98	6.37	20.53	9.74	12.15 ¹
3.16	10.07	2.13	11.48	37.89	5.05	29.78 ¹

¹ Indicates per cent of decrease.

44. Please give your reason for adopting attendance as the basis of comparison rather than register which the City Superintendent has always maintained was necessary?

Answer. I believe it to be nearer a correct or exact report of school conditions, though both are used, and should perhaps be used together. (See pp. 64-71.)

268 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

45. Will you care to modify your comments on the reductions in Board of Education estimates or refer to Dr. Bachman's report on the method heretofore used in computing estimates?

Answer. No. I have taken account of his report already.

46. As the tabular matter on galleys 420-421 is taken from the reports of the Finance Committee of the Board of Education, will you consider the advisability of referring to that report and condensing your statement into a summary?

Answer. No. I prefer to let it stand as it is. (See pp. 58-71.)

47. Your figures are incorrect in several instances in tables on galley 28. Do you prefer to verify and correct, or shall we make necessary corrections?

Answer. No. I prefer to use figures furnished by the Board of Education. For several years during the discussion of "Equal Pay," alternative estimates were submitted, the one based on the assumption that conditions were to go on as they were, the other that equal pay legislation might be enacted during the year. Controversy as to what the exact figures of the estimates were is raised by playing one of these alternative sets of figures against the other. The budgets were made on the former basis and the figures of the Board of Education which I have used are correct.

48. Is it still practicable to add the increase in cost by kinds of service? (See p. 70.)

Answer. I do not understand what is meant here.

49. Please give your reason for not including the amount of stock spent during a fiscal year in your statement "M."

Answer. The allotment was not by years, even nominally, until July, 1910. (See p. 72.) The payments made on buildings under construction during any given year would not show the magnitude of the building operations under way for that year, as more than one year is usually required for the completion of one of these permanent buildings. Besides the expenditure of corporate stock after it has been authorized is greatly delayed by the getting of authority to go ahead.

50. Will you please indicate any instance in which the entire amount of corporate stock voted by the Board of Estimate in the Corporate Stock Budget has not been available to the Board of Education at all times whenever it saw fit to use such sum?

Answer. Consult the record of the case of the F. A. Clark Company *vs.* the Board of Education, now pending in the courts. Other instances might be given. (See p. 57.)

51. When you say that the repair funds were "arbitrarily reduced," did you have in mind the method employed by the Board of Education in the years given to learn the amount of repairs needed, and the questions asked by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to bring out such facts?

Answer. The facts are as stated in the report. (See p. 57.)

52. How much money was obtained by the Board of Education by the special act referred to to relieve the shortage of funds in the repair account?

Answer. Not material; they were without funds. (See p. 72.)

53. Were the changes of position by the Board of Estimate, referred to, made necessary by the very same conditions which were submitted at budget time or by some new conditions, *i. e.*, was the addition to the supply fund in 1911 for purposes which were denied when the budget was first voted?

Answer. In part made necessary by the very same conditions. (See p. 74.)

54. As you base statement on the percentage changes would you consider re-arranging table on pp. 64-69 so that percentage increase on attendance can be directly compared?

Answer. Yes. I have done so in part above. (See answer to 43.)

55. Did you find any instance where the Board of Education asked for more money than it expected and later expressed satisfaction with the reduced amount? In making your statement, did you take into account the available funds in various state funds?

Answer. The Board of Education did not; certain members may have expressed satisfaction, but not the board acting officially. The statements are complete for what they undertake to show. For state funds, see answer to question 141.

56. Can you indicate advantages which the schools have obviously lost, caused by lack of funds as shown by any of the various inquiries?

Answer. The results of the various inquiries are not in my hands. My report shows many advantages which have been denied.

57. In criticising the Comptroller's requirements as to itemized bills, supplementary records, etc., did you consult any of the Comptroller's representatives or any recognized accounting experts in private or corporation business?

Answer. I have worked with expert accountants in my own staff for some years. Simpler methods are possible and the Board of Education accounts are not city accounts as contemplated in Section 149 of the charter. (See pp. 75-77.)

58. Were you familiar with the so-called piano scandals of the Board of Education and of the tremendous decreases in price which have been effected in various supplies?

Answer. Not material to my inquiry.

59. Did you notice whether the Auditor of the Board of Education makes any effort to give the equivalent of the auditing supervision requested by the Comptroller? Had you read the report of Accountant West in which he quotes various reasons given by the Auditor of the Board of Education for not having exercised such auditing supervision?

Answer. Not material to my inquiry. I was not detailed to investigate the Auditor's office. Mr. West's report has not been made available.

60. Before repeating the statement that complying with the Comptroller's request would increase cost from twenty-five per cent to thirty per cent, did you make any examination to learn whether this statement is true or false? If so, what examination did you make and what did you ascertain with respect to the experience of other departments where the rule is enforced?

Answer. Its source is given and its reason plain. It is used to show an unwarranted encroachment upon the by-law-making power of the Board of Education. The Committee on Buildings held that the power of the Board of Education to make its own by-laws was arbitrarily set aside by uniform accounting requirements which were thrust upon it. These, it believed, also materially increased the expense of doing the business. (See pp. 75-76.)

61. In citing the deductions for absence in one month, did you ask what the total number of deductions for the year should be?

Answer. My statement is correct for what it attempts to show. (See p. 76.)

62. Would you mean to say that neither the Board of Education nor the Board of Estimate ought to know whether the losses occur and whether they may be reduced, as is alleged by the Board of Education itself?

Answer. I would not, and have not. (See p. 76.)

63. Before stating that the Comptroller's suggestion would delay the delivery of supplies, did you ascertain that such has been the result in other departments of the city?

Answer. Immaterial, as it plainly would delay delivery here greatly. That is both self-evident and the result of experience. (See pp. 76-77.)

64. Before committing yourself and permitting your colleagues to commit themselves on so important a question as "synchronizing" accounts, did you know that the important change you criticise released last year, by reconciling different department books alone, nearly \$10,000,000?

Answer. Actual dollars or accounts? And accounts of *city* departments? Whereas the accounts of the Board of Education are the accounts of an independent corporation, of a state department. (See p. 77.)

65. Before making this criticism, did you attempt to ascertain the point of view or actual work of the Comptroller's department?

Answer. I saw the effect of its work upon the school system. (See p. 77.)

66. Will you furnish concrete illustrations to prove the "hindrance to efficiency" forced upon the Board of Education by the uniform method of accounting?

Answer. Yes, they are in the report. (See pp. 75-76.)

67. What evidence is there that "every change in officers at the City Hall involves a new system and method of doing city business"?

Answer. There is an abundance of it which can be produced at a judicial hearing. (See p. 77.)

68. Since you and your colleagues are committed to the extreme statement that "each department exists to perform its own work under conditions peculiar to that work which make its task different from those of other departments," will you show how, if at all, centralized

272 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

accounting is less applicable to school matters than to hospital matters or police matters?

Answer. Such uniform accounting as has been prescribed for the Board of Education is not desirable anywhere, for it puts record-making above work. What about the law? The courts have held that the schools are not on a parity with the other city departments. (See p. 77.)

69. If you cannot point to such conditions, do you still mean to take the position that departments having different kinds of work cannot, as is actually being done for all national departments, be made more effective by a central and uniform accounting?

Answer. It has not been done at Washington, and would be disastrous if it were, I believe. Standardized accounting is different. (See p. 77.)

70. Do results show that the schools of Boston, Philadelphia, Indianapolis, etc., have had a larger percentage increase in appropriations, year by year, than the schools of New York, or that the difference between the original estimates of amounts needed and amounts finally allowed is materially greater than in New York?

Answer. General laws fix the maximum amount which these boards of education may levy for school purposes. Within this limit they levy what they require. The maximum is liberal enough to enable them to levy what they require for the schools. Their estimate and their budget are identical. (See pp. 78-85.)

71. Will you give evidence that New York City's large board is "split up into factions"?

Answer. The evidence could have been had by attending the meetings of the board. (See pp. 85-86.)

72. Can you furnish concrete instances to prove numerous unsupported assertions regarding things which the Board of Education has done and left undone? For example, if the board did not play a strong part in educational legislation affecting equal pay, what did it do? Will you give illustrations of "recommendations and suggestions which its own experts have made for the improvement of its work" and which it has not "sufficiently considered"?

Answer. If the board did not play a strong part, it played a weak one. This is shown by the lack of space in its minutes devoted to this important subject. The Mayor appointed a committee to investigate it and the Board of Estimate thought it

necessary to appoint another committee for the same purpose. This committee made a very effective and thorough report. But it belonged to the Board of Education to handle the matter, as Governor Hughes pointed out, and I have found no evidence that it went about it in this very exhaustive way.

As to recommendations which have not been sufficiently considered, those of the City Superintendent are a case in point. I may perhaps assume that "judicial notice" will be taken of the action of the board in regard to the merging of eligible lists.

The judgments which are made concerning the things which the Board of Education has not done are due to standards which have been worked out through years of familiarity with the work of school boards, and a very careful study and analysis of the journals of the Board of Education, attendance upon its meetings, and a number of talks with members and with those immediately concerned in its work. The truth of my statements has been publicly acknowledged by at least one very active and able member of the board. A close examination into its work at the time I made this investigation will verify every statement I have made. That, and not any incidents which may be given, is the only means of verifying the facts which I have had the honor to report. (See pp. 86-87.)

73. Is it not true that in many places fifteen would be considered too large a board? Do you not care to indicate a preference for any figure between five and fifteen?

Answer. It is true, but fifteen is not generally considered too large a board for a large city. I am not interested in a speculation as to the exact number needed. What is essential is a board whose size will not prevent unity, comprehension of its work, and energy in performing it. (See p. 88.)

74. When you speak of the "experience of the United States" against the payment of school boards, will you specify the places which have had such experience?

Answer. San Francisco and Rochester now have it. (See pp. 88-89.)

75. Would you say that the citizens who are serving on the Board of Education in Rochester for \$1000 a year are exceptions to your generalization?

Answer. I would not, since they may happen to be good or bad. The plan is bad.

274 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

76. Will you make clearer what functions our New York board is assuming to itself which you feel should be given to educational experts?

Answer. I have made this clear in the report. Making a course of study is a definite case. (See p. 110.)

77. Is there any place in the country where the city superintendent of schools is the business manager, such as you describe?

Answer. Yes, many. London, which is a larger community, is one. The others are too numerous to mention. In all, except a few of the larger cities, this is the method. (See p. 91.)

78. Will you make it somewhat clearer how the Board of Education committees could be as efficient as you describe them and the administrative results be so unsatisfactory as you find, *i. e.*, if the Board of Education only meets and formally ratifies what committees have done, what harm can result?

Answer. Lack of unity, energy, and coördinate planning, which does not prevent each committee from doing good internal work. (See p. 94.)

79. Will you illustrate by some concrete instances how the educational interests have been sacrificed by the confusion of authority among committees which you liken to "pride-protecting, independent states"?

Answer. The report contains instances. (See pp. 98-100.)

80. Will you illustrate the "delay in conducting the business of the board by retention of executive duties"?

Answer. It is inevitable, and illustrations are abundant in the report. (See pp. 96-102.)

81. Will you indicate "some of the more important matters" which the board has failed to consider?

Answer. See report, pages 86-87, and your own question, 72.

82. Will you indicate some cases in which the board has "tied the hands of its administrative staff"?

Answer. The system does that. (See pp. 96-97.)

83. Please indicate how the committees can be as efficient as you state earlier if they have no one to push the recommendations of special reports, etc.

Answer. Their efficiency is internal. This is an external relation and concerns special work by the staff, for the most part. The fault is with the system. (See pp. 95-96.)

84. Will you illustrate the statement, "Thus extraordinary matters take much more time than the ordinary ones"?

Answer. Because so many investigations of them must be made in place of one authoritative investigation. Study the efforts to increase the number of anæmic classes in the minutes of the several committees. (See p. 99.)

85. Will you give illustrations of delays in procuring and allotting supplies, due to changes made in the conduct of the schools, citing authorizations by the board for purposes for which no provision had been made in the budget?

Answer. If a new course of study in drawing is put in during the year, it requires new and perhaps more expensive supplies and is a case in point. (See p. 101.)

86. Will you indicate whether you conferred with the Secretary of the Central Committee, local school boards, Manhattan, or other officers, or read the minutes of their various conferences?

Answer. I did confer with an officer who is very active in that organization, who read and approved that section of my report. (See p. 101.)

87. What have you to say concerning the handbook of instructions worked out by this Central Committee?

Answer. I believe it makes the work too technical and much too complicated for lay members and school visitors to perform.

88. Will you give concrete illustrations of duplication of work?

Answer. Ample illustrations are given in the report. (See pp. 101-102.)

89. Were not the same duplications of work found in the field where the City Superintendent has absolute power and for which he is the manager you advise?

Answer. Where is this field? It is not known to me, nor in my detail.

90. Is there evidence that the board, working through the executive committee in July and August, does business with greater dispatch and

276 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

more efficiency than when working through forty-six members the rest of the year?

Answer. It attempts only to keep up the routine business in the absence of most of the members, and very naturally. (See p. 103.)

91. Will you make it clear how you would restate some of these charter provisions so as to differentiate the Superintendent's functions?

Answer. I am not writing a charter, but can, if need be, do so. (See p. 104.)

92. Will you quote charter provision specifically to justify the statement that strictly speaking the Superintendent "has no authority to guide and direct the schools whatever"?

Answer. Yes. Read them all and tell what complete things he can do. (See p. 104.)

93. Is your statement regarding supplies here compatible with your later statement that the delay in standardizing supplies is due to the inaction of the Superintendent?

Answer. There is no such statement in the report. It reads "as yet the *Board of Superintendents* has not taken action." (See p. 221.)

94. Who else but the Superintendent of Schools has anything to do with "proper organization of reports and statistical information"?

Answer. An accounting interest. (See p. 105.)

95. What charter provision prevents his coördinating these functions?

Answer. The absence of the right one. (See pp. 104-105.)

96. Would not the president of the board have authority to call conferences of bureau chiefs?

Answer. Authority, but not time or knowledge of details of work. (See p. 105.)

97. Do you not think you should modify your statement that there is "just one thing" which the Superintendent with his own authority can do by noting (1) that the power to prescribe blank forms is subject to the Board of Education; (2) that he may reassign at pleasure eight associate and twenty-six district superintendents, enforce compulsory education law, nominate and supervise attendance officers, and (3)

that he may exercise indirect powers which have led your colleagues in this report to say that he has discouraged initiative in the Board of Education staff?

Answer. Your correction is right in part, since it calls attention to a partial mistake. But your correction of this mistake is wrong. The City Superintendent is chairman of the Board of Examiners and assigns them to their various duties. He nominates the members of that board from a list prepared after competitive examination by the Municipal Civil Service Commission. He prescribes the examinations. But this has been held to mean that he determines the time of each examination, fixes the subjects of each examination and the lowest passing mark. The courts have held that the charter gives the City Superintendent power to compile all eligible lists, but the anti-merging law limits that right almost to the point of taking it away. Licenses may be issued only after examination by the Board of Examiners. Each license is good for one year. It may be renewed by the City Superintendent for three successive years and at the close of the third year may be made permanent. This implies that he may cut off a license at the close of any year if the work is unsatisfactory. In the nature of the case this must be largely determined or entirely upon the judgment of others, such as principals, district and associate superintendents, etc. The City Superintendent is chairman of the Board of Superintendents and may assign the associate and district superintendents to their duties "subject to the By-laws of the Board of Education," Sec. 1078. On all matters that come before the Board of Superintendents, he has one vote in nine. His power to enforce the compulsory Education law is very incomplete. (See p. 50.) His power to "appoint such clerks as he may deem necessary" has also been greatly abridged. (See p. 152.) Indirect powers are unfortunate statements of duty and prerogative, for they inevitably lead to indirect action. It is to eliminate the necessity for this that the Superintendent's clearly defined powers should be extended. (See p. 107.)

98. Will you indicate how, if at all, you would change the charter wording with respect to qualification and salary? How would you change the charter wording as to his authority on the educational side?

Answer. Not material to this inquiry. I will provide this at another time if desired. (See pp. 106-107.)

99. Does your statement that the Superintendent is but one in the Board of Superintendents "without more authority than the others"

278 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

need to be qualified by the fact that he has power to assign and reassign them?

Answer. Read the sentence as a whole. Authority in official meetings for the transaction of business is meant. (See p. 108.)

100. Can you give illustrations to support the implication that the City Superintendent is prevented by his associates "from exercising more than the nominal functions of his office"?

Answer. What is said and meant is that this scheme of administration makes him a titular head. (See p. 108.)

101. Can you make recommendations as to present reports received by the Board of Education which will give it the benefit of "constant inquiry, regular records, and repeated reports," etc.?

Answer. I cannot. I am recommending that a scheme of reports be instituted which will do this. (See pp. 109-110.)

102. Can you give illustrations of complaints and of their handling at present?

Answer. They are handled in the way I have indicated. (See pp. 110-111.)

103. Will you state definitely the number of teachers who come from outside the city?

Answer. This question is not pertinent to anything said in the text of the report. It seems to refer to the sentence (p. 111): "The school system of New York is an inbreeding system," and the one which follows it, "There is a fence about it which has been made into a wall by the recent action prohibiting the merging of eligible lists." The school system is an inbreeding system. It has a fence around it and it ought to have a fence around it. That fence has not been too high to let in hundreds, perhaps even thousands of good teachers from other places. But how many superintendents and holders of directive positions has it admitted? If one goes to London he finds a goodly number of new men from the other cities of Great Britain in directive positions there. A kind of promotion by merit to superior posts at the capital obtains in the school system of the British Empire. This renews the life of the educational service. This policy obtains to but an insignificant degree in New York. New teachers come in. They must learn to fit themselves into conditions pretty definitely established before they came. In time they may be promoted, but they

now represent the system in which they are promoted. The recent anti-merging law has made the fence into a wall around the school system. This law is bound to have disastrous consequences. Tabulations are of little significance here. What is needed is a clear understanding of principles and how they apply.

104. Will you state definitely the number of teachers discharged each year?

Answer. Impossible, but it is very small, as I have learned from a careful analysis of the minutes for a long period. (See pp. 111-112.)

105. Will you state definitely the number of certificates made into permanent license and the number not so made?

Answer. This will be found in Professor Elliott's report, page 78. (See pp. 111-112.)

106. Will you show how far these discrepancies are due to law and how far to the present administration of existing law?

Answer. See Professor Elliott's report for a discussion of this matter. (See pp. 111-112.)

107. Please state in how many of the cities mentioned by you as having better organization than New York, medical examination is entirely with the school board.

Answer. The cities are not cited as being the best in all respects. An overwhelming number of cities have found it to their advantage to put the medical examination of school children for impediments to education under the control of the Board of Education. (See pp. 78-84.)

108. Is it relevant that the reason New York's Department of Health has school nurses and school physicians is that it took the initiative and asked for money for these purposes before the school authorities requested or welcomed such help?

Answer. Not as a determination of the proper method. (See p. 112.)

109. Is there reason to believe that the Health Department has been less efficient in its supervision of physical examinations than has the School Department in that health supervision for which it is exclu-

sively responsible, *i. e.*, health instruction so criticised by your colleagues?

Answer. The dismemberment of work whose parts belong together causes this in part. (See p. 112.)

110. Will you indicate the number of years for which cost, based on average daily attendance, has been kept? In stating that cost has been kept, have you had in mind that the Auditor disclaims keeping cost accounts and keeps only amounts of money spent, not cost?

Answer. It is now being done. (See p. 113.)

111. Will you care to refer to the uniform reports now agreed upon by the National Education Association?

Answer. Not material. I have the report and have used it. What we are suggesting and what is being done in New York goes ahead of it.

112. What do you mean when you say that New York City "has not been free to employ the most scientific ways and means which have been perfected"?

Answer. Confusion in administration has prevented it. (See p. 114.)

113. Will you report any evidence found that the schools have already begun to give what you call "qualitative cost accounting"?

Answer. In New York, or elsewhere? There is evidence that the thing is being begun. (See p. 114.)

114. Do you know of anybody in New York who is trying to have a "comparison of the total cost of school with school"?

Answer. Not asserted. See Estimates, 1912, which were made in that form in accordance with the Comptroller's requirement. (See p. 116.)

115. Is it not true that in cities and states which have the most efficient school reporting, facts are reported by schools and by cities? Would you say that comparisons between costs in different sections of New York City are without value?

Answer. If the figures are anatomized both in New York and in other cities, but not otherwise. Such figures have value to those who can anatomize them, but hardly to the public at large. (See p. 116.)

The "Two Hundred and Forty-One Questions" 281

116. Does your metaphor as to keeping account of the money spent for food for the hand or the head, etc., apply to supplies, coal, janitor service, repairs, etc.?

Answer. See text of the report. It does apply to experiments made for the whole system. (See p. 116.)

117. Inasmuch as the City Superintendent has always maintained that the proper unit is the register, not the attendance or the hour of instruction, will you refer to that again here under "the proper unit"?

Answer. I am not investigating the City Superintendent. (See p. 116.)

118. When you say that the only reason cost accounting has not been started "is that sufficient clerical help was not available," will you cite requests in budget estimates for carrying out the plan you mention?

Answer. Budget requests for a larger statistical force have been made and refused. (See p. 117.)

119. Would not cost of instruction in each grade and each subject help school authorities consider the educational value of these subjects?

Answer. How? See text of the report, page 117.

120. Has any school department anywhere what corresponds to your proposed Bureau of Standards?

Answer. I think none has, but that is not material to the value of the recommendation. (See p. 119.)

121. With whom would the Bureau of Standards work if the Board of Superintendents is abolished, as recommended in the school inquiry report?

Answer. The superintendents. See revised proof in your office when this letter was sent. (See pp. 119-120.)

122. In recommending one statistical division, did you consult the recommendations of the special committee of the board made in 1905?

Answer. Yes. (See p. 120.)

123. Can you summarize here the work done by the Board of Education's special committee on reports and records?

Answer. Not in shape when my report was made.

282 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

124. Will you indicate who has been confused and with what results by failure of the fiscal and educational reports to "synchronize"?

Answer. Immaterial to the truth of the statement. (See p. 122.)

125. Will you care to suggest means of preventing waste of the Superintendent's reports if distributed among principals and teachers, such as printing digests, etc.? To how many of the local school board members are reports now sent?

Answer. The English government charges a small fee; that prevents waste. Reports are now sent to the chairman of each local school board. (See pp. 123-125.)

126. Do you care to suggest how many reports would be needed in New York to cover the demand?

Answer. No. That requires special investigation. (See p. 123.)

127. Will you state whether your criticisms and recommendations agree with those made by the board's special committee?

Answer. Theirs were not available when mine were made.

128. Is the secretary now responsible for the reports and minutes which you say need an expert? Are the salaries now paid to the secretary and to the various committee secretaries now responsible for this work sufficient to command expert service of this kind?

Answer. I have no knowledge on this last point. I recommended an expert to look after mechanical preparation and printing of reports. The secretary prepares the reports. (See p. 125.)

129. In speaking of the delay in publishing the major reports, do you care to note how soon after the end of the school year the Superintendent's report has been published for the last five years?

Answer. Professor Elliott is reporting upon the Superintendent's office.

130. When characterizing budget estimate methods, will you state whether or not you found that the Board of Education has "scientifically and accurately" prepared its estimates heretofore with respect to matters not treated in Dr. Bachman's report on salary estimates?

Answer. Not in my instructions to work out the history of this subject; that is not profitable. (See p. 128.)

131. Will you cite instances of "reckless cutting" of estimates or reckless inflating of them?

Answer. I have not stated that "reckless cutting" is done, though it is, and a number of instances are cited in the report. (See p. 128.)

132. Will you please state instances where "the Board of Education is told that the total amount of money to be devoted to school purposes has been determined before its estimates were considered"?

Answer. I have not stated that it is done, but "if it is," etc. As a matter of fact it has been done, as the evidence taken at your "hearing" shows, and is entirely within possibility at any time and on the present method of raising school funds; a warning against it "if done" was not therefore untimely. (See p. 128.)

133. Did you mean to imply that New York's Board of Estimate has heretofore been "unfamiliar with school routine, unaware of school interests, and unappreciative of school standards"?

Answer. Read the report, "*Whenever* the virtual responsibility," etc. (See p. 128.)

134. When you state that the smaller school districts of New York State are "altogether better provided with funds" than is the Board of Education in the largest and richest city of the state and nation," will you give a comparison of the per capita appropriations or the percentage increase, year by year, of some of these districts, or all of them, with New York City?

Answer. Not material to statements of the report, as the law only is discussed. (See p. 128.)

135. Did you discover evidence that in New York City there has been "bitter and frequently unjustified criticism of school authorities by the Board of Estimate"? Will you specify such instances?

Answer. Not asserted. As a matter of fact, there has been far too much of it. Your quotation marks are not correctly placed. See the report, page 129.

136. If you know of instances where the Board of Education failed to make its "estimates exact and scientific statements of its needs," will you give them?

Answer. Not material to the statement of the text. (See p. 129.)

284 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

137. Did you discover any instance where the Board of Estimate prepared an estimate for the conduct of the schools?

Answer. Not stated. (See p. 129.)

138. Cannot the experience of "the greatest variable (*i. e.*, high-priced teachers dropping out; low-priced teachers coming in), in the whole system" be ascertained by taking several years' results?

Answer. Not exactly, but theoretically. And if the theory is used for more than it is worth the schools will suffer. (See p. 130.)

139. Did you discover any plan worked out by the school authorities for progressively reducing the size of classes?

Answer. Not in my instructions. Lack of funds has made the formulation of such a detailed plan impractical. As much is done as can be under present conditions, I am sure. (See p. 130.)

140. Have you found instances where the Board of Education has asked for "a marginal item set apart for betterment of service," etc.?

Answer. Not asserted. (See p. 132.)

141. Did you undertake to learn whether the board has treated state funds and unexpended balances as such "marginal item" for years?

Answer. From the budget for 1913 I take the following, which tells something about the disposition which is made of the state money: "General School Fund for the year 1913, the equivalent of three mills on every dollar of assessed valuation of the Real and Personal Estate in the City of New York, liable to taxation, as certified to the Board of Education by the Department of Taxes and Assessments, including so much of the State School Money apportioned by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the City of New York, or any of the Counties contained therein, which State School Money when received shall be paid into the General Fund for the reduction of taxation." There are other state funds which are trust funds and may be used only for the purposes for which the state grants them. They are therefore in a very limited sense marginal to the other funds for school maintenance. There are three such funds:

1. Libraries and Apparatus High Schools
2. Bonus fund High Schools
3. Training School Fund

From the first, expenditure can be made only for such books and apparatus as are approved by the Regents of the University. It

cannot be used for general supplies. The regents check up the use of this fund strictly to see that it is used according to their rules. The restrictions governing the second fund are not so exacting. It is used as an auxiliary supply fund for high schools and taken account of as such. It was formerly known as the Literature Fund and its intent was to foster the purchase of educational decorations, pictures, statuary, and special items required for the betterment of the high schools. It has been diverted from its original purpose and perhaps should not have been. It is apportioned as granted under the regents' formula. The third fund may be used for any purpose in training schools. It is apportioned as granted by the regents' formula. There is so great a shortage in high school supplies this year that the Board of Education has had to anticipate its December, 1912, apportionment of bonus money and issue orders in advance of its receipt, making an understanding with those who supply goods under this arrangement that they will wait for their money until the Bonus Fund is apportioned. Ordinarily this apportionment would be used in 1913.

142. Will you list the experiments and extensions of work which have been financed out of such marginal items in spite of alleged insufficient budgets?

Answer. None have been made. See answer to 141.

143. Did you mean to imply that in New York City school officials have been forbidden to think of new departures as utterly impractical and not to be thought of from the first?

Answer. In effect they have, in recent years. There was no encouragement to think of new departures during the school terms. (See pp. 132-133.)

144. Did you verify your statement that the "Bureau of Buildings" observes and determines its requirements by means of carefully conducted local inspections?

Answer. Not asserted in copy in your hands when this letter was sent.

145. Did you compare some of the estimates submitted for repairs with later departure from such estimates after money was voted?

Answer. Not material, as the Board of Education administers school funds under the law. (See pp. 133-134.)

286 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

146. Did you mean to imply that the initiative in getting a stated percentage allowance for repairs originated with the Board of Education Building Committee?

Answer. No implication was made or stated. (See pp. 133-134.)

147. Will you include here the part that the charter contemplates local boards shall take in repair matters, if any, and the part which the local boards actually have played or should play?

Answer. The charter passages are confusing and, I believe, unworkable in this particular. (See the chapter on the Local School Boards.)

148. In saying that "deferred repairs mean extra expense when the work is finally undertaken," did you mean to contradict the statement in writing by President Winthrop to the Board of Estimate that there was no evidence of such increase having been entailed by former reductions in repair allowances?

Answer. Deterioration goes on, which of necessity means extra expense. (See p. 135.)

149. Will you state whether or not the superintending staff has heretofore made "careful investigations to furnish the basis for accurate figures" of supplies?

Answer. Not asserted in copy of report in your hands when this letter was sent.

150. Have you found instances of official statements to the Board of Estimate that "complaints from principals are numerous; the children are not receiving enough supplies to carry out the course of study"?

Answer. The Board of Education makes its official statement of its needs in its estimates, and they have been reduced in spite of its protests. (See p. 139.)

151. In connection with the two estimates, general and special funds, can you give information as to the amount of time given by the Board of Education committees in the preparation of these estimates and by the Finance Committee as such?

Answer. See answers to 2 and 3 of first list of questions.

152. When you say that past failure "has been due to a positive inability to furnish the suggested information," etc., have you found

no instance of radically wrong method and of such radically wrong method persisted in after attention has been called to it?

Answer. Not asserted in copy of report in your hands when this letter was sent. (See pp. 142-143.)

153. When you speak of the important plan for securing data regarding the selection of sites, etc., would it be pertinent to mention who started that new plan? Please indicate the nature of the plan which it displaced, *i. e.*, the plan that proceeded on the assumption that more schools were needed in the immediate neighborhood of schools with part time.

Answer. I have not attempted to write the natural history of this school department. (See p. 143.)

154. Please cite instances where buildings were obviously located in the wrong places.

Answer. There are such instances and they can be had by inquiring at the office of the Board of Education for them.

155. Can you state the number of cases where "local school boards, civic bodies, individuals, and other agencies" have taken the initiative in proposing new schools or additions, and what evidence there is?

Answer. No, but I have examined the evidence which is on file at the offices of the Board of Education. (See p. 143.)

156. Is not evidence given in other reports that attention has not been heretofore given to requests from local school boards, etc.?

Answer. Not material here.

157. Do your investigations warrant so unqualified a statement as that "there is not an inch of waste space at any point" in the planning of New York school buildings?"

Answer. Not asserted in report in your hands when this letter was sent.

158. Do your investigations show whether in recent years conferences between the Board of Estimate representative and the Board of Education have saved or lost money, have increased or decreased the number and suitability of locations and buildings?

Answer. Not pertinent to my instructions. I am not investigating how the Board of Estimate has gone about its work.

288 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

159. Do your investigations warrant any statement with respect to unused sites held by the Board of Education and the abandonment of sites on the ground that they are not in the right places?

Answer. Not essential to a discussion of the system of school administration in an attempt to describe its working machinery now.

160. Will you care to state the lapse of time between the submission of the final Corporate Stock Budget for schools to the Board of Estimate, and its final adoption?

Answer. I am not reporting how the Board of Estimate goes about its business.

161. Can you give a record of overtime spent by the Board of Education clerical staff?

Answer. Such records are on file at the offices of the Board of Education. (See p. 148.)

162. Can you note the work which is not kept up to date?

Answer. I have in part done so. (See p. 148.)

163. Is the only reason why minutes are not "typewritten for some months back" that there is not help enough?

Answer. That is the chief reason. (See p. 148.)

164. Has the Board of Education stated these facts to the Board of Estimate when preparing its annual estimates?

Answer. It has asked for larger allowances and has not gotten them.

165. Did you verify the statement of the assistant secretary of the board that "practically no salaries for additional clerks have been allowed for five years"?

Answer. Yes. (See p. 148.)

166. Would you be willing to add the year 1907 to your table?

Answer. Why? Is not three enough to show present conditions? (See p. 148.)

167. Can you state quantitatively the "heavy burden of clerical labor" added to the school board by "the new methods of doing business with the Finance Department"? When you made this state-

ment, were you aware that the Auditor of the Board of Education has thus far refused to comply with the alleged hampering requirements?

Answer. This last does not invalidate the first. The heavy burden which this investigation alone put upon the offices can hardly be shown quantitatively.

168. Did you find no unnecessary clerical work which could be dispensed with to provide for needed work without adding new workers?

Answer. I am not reorganizing the offices or directed to make such an investigation. It is possible that a reorganization of work would relieve the pressure in some degree. But the fact is that the volume of business to-day is much greater than it was three years ago and no corresponding increase in the staff has been allowed.

169. Did you mean that almost daily requests for statistical information for special purposes had come this last year for new matters?

Answer. They are very frequent, and for a long time I made almost daily requests for such information myself. (See p. 149.)

170. Will you give further illustrations to support the statement that the offices of the Board of Education "have become in large part a place of supplying information to other municipal departments"?

Answer. This can be done, but the sample illustrations I have given are enough. (See p. 149.)

171. Will you support your statements regarding special clerks with facts, *i. e.*, what evidence have you that clerks are well trained, that salaries are low, that promotions come too infrequently, that opportunity is better in other departments?

Answer. See report as to transfers to other departments which would not ask for them if the facts were not as I have indicated. (See p. 150.)

172. Please state what percentage of the total number of employees the transfers which have taken place in two years constitute.

Answer. See your own statement in question 174. (See p. 152.)

173. Would the resulting fraction show a high percentage of transfers and resignations?

Answer. Yes, if both are taken, which you have not done. The process is still going on. (See pp. 150-151.)

290 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

174. You show five transfers in 1910 and sixteen in 1911. Do you call this "wholesale depleting of a staff of over 300 employees"?

Answer. Yes, when taken with the resignations. Tastes differ in these matters. Personally I should be distressed by such a condition in my own staff. (See pp. 150 and 151 and Appendices C and D.

175. Before stating that the consent and approval of the Board of Estimate to transfers takes away all flexibility and possibility of adjustment, did you note the requests for adjustment made by the Board of Education and denied by the Board of Estimate?

Answer. Not material to my statement. Flexibility is taken away by the system itself, which also seems to exist without legal warrant. (See p. 152.)

176. Can you give an instance where the Board of Education has been unable to put a \$600 clerk in a \$750 position temporarily?

Answer. Not asserted in the report. The illustration given indicates the defect of the system exactly. (See p. 152.)

177. Before commenting upon uncertainty due to the Committee on Standardization of Salaries in city offices, did you attempt to ascertain what its purpose was? Have you any reason to believe that it will not standardize up as well as down?

Answer. This is not the point. Every employee is now uncertain as to what his salary will be when "standardized." (See pp. 152-153.)

178. When citing a loss of \$100,000 due to an "unwitting increase" of salaries, did you attempt to ascertain the teachers' salary litigation due to unwitting mistakes by the Board of Education in matters where it has exclusive power?

Answer. Not material to the truth of my statement. (See p. 153.)

179. Will you note to whom the Auditor's letter quoted was addressed?

Answer. Not material. It is an official document. (See p. 153.)

180. Will you give facts to show that the board has not built up a permanent staff?

Answer. See the tables showing transfers and resignations and remember the process still goes on. (See pp. 150-151.)

181. What evidence have you that present salary schedules fix pay for persons instead of for positions?

Answer. Not stated, but the opposite is stated. (See p. 154.)

182. Do you consider that the reports which school superintendents have heretofore received "keep them officially informed" as to where new sites are needed?

Answer. Reports of attendance do. (See p. 156.)

183. In commenting on the mistakes "sometimes made in anticipating future needs," did you review the list of sites not used by the board?

Answer. Their number is given in the report. (See p. 162.)

184. Will you give the exact figures for your statement "in almost nine cases out of ten the Board of Estimate requests the Board of Education" to substitute a site selected by the former?

Answer. The exact figures are ten cases in ten, for the sites committee has found it useless to select them, since that counts for nothing in obtaining them, no matter how desirable. It therefore places the whole matter before the Comptroller's representative and he makes the decision which determines the location. (See p. 158.)

185. Will you state whether the general effect of the Board of Estimate's so-called interference has been to locate buildings nearer to or farther from school centers and whether sites have been more or less expensive?

Answer. This is not the point. The law makes the Board of Education select sites for school buildings, and they should be located for educational reasons. This pertains to the work of the school authorities and can be done well in the long run by them only. The law should, I believe, be changed so that the whole responsibility for sites should be in the hands of the Board of Education. The present division of functions is bad. Sites have not always been well located. (See pp. 158-159.)

186. Will you indicate whether the idea of scientific study of sites originated with the Board of Estimate or Board of Education?

Answer. I am not reporting on the natural history of these things, or investigating the details of the Board of Estimate's work. (See pp. 158-159.)

292 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

187. Will you state what part the permanent census board has been asked to play in locating sites and whether it was the Board of Education or the Board of Estimate that called for this census?

Answer. The working details of the new plan are not yet completed. What has been done is reported. For the second part, see the answer to question 186. (See p. 160.)

188. Will you estimate how much money you would regard as "sufficient funds" at the disposal of the Board of Education to enable it satisfactorily to anticipate its necessities before they become so pressing?

Answer. Whatever is found to be needed. (See pp. 163-164.)

189. In stating the steps in budget and Corporate Stock Budget procedure, did you consult the minutes of the hearings before the Board of Estimate committees?

Answer. Not material to anything in my report or in my instructions. I am reporting only on estimates and the making of estimates, not on the making of budgets.

190. Do you consider that the staff of the Bureau of Buildings did a heavy year's work in the year mentioned in view of the fact that they started the year with stock plans for schools which you refer to as economical and expeditious?

Answer. Not asserted. The fact that plans have been made for former buildings does not provide plans for new ones. (See p. 168.)

191. By whom is the secretary's register of steps in building used for purpose of hastening construction?

Answer. It is plainly not used for the purpose of hastening construction, but for the purpose of hastening and recording the making of the contract. (See p. 169.)

192. Did you note whether this criticism of delays due to inadequate repair funds has been made in the formal estimates submitted to the Board of Estimate?

Answer. The estimates are submitted in writing. It is the duty of the finance authorities who assume to cut them to find out whether such cut is justified and what effect it has upon the work which ought to be done. (See p. 180.)

The "Two Hundred and Forty-One Questions" 293

193. Have you found anywhere concrete evidence that any delays thus far caused have resulted in increased expenditures for "defective roofs, leaders, etc."?

Answer. Deterioration goes on and repairs are more expensive when they must at last be made. (See p. 180.)

194. Will you care to state what effort you have made to verify statements and answers to questions to the building superintendent?

Answer. A part are self-evident, a part documentary, a part are matters of expert opinion, and could only be verified by a board of architects of equal standing. The only thoroughly satisfactory and conclusive method of verifying them would be to call for a judicial investigation and put witnesses under oath. I certify these statements to be correct to the best of my knowledge and ability; they can easily be presented in the form of an affidavit, if that is required. (See p. 180.)

195. What effort is recorded in the Board of Education to secure these facts and to present them to the Board of Estimate?

Answer. Representing the Board of Estimate, I had no difficulty in getting them. The Board of Education maintains quite properly that it, not the Board of Estimate, is charged with the administration of the schools. It naturally does not refer these matters to the Board of Estimate, but submits its estimates of its needs.

196. In discussing methods of purchasing pianos, did you notice whether the method has changed since the so-called piano scandals?

Answer. Not material to a statement of the method used now. (See p. 190.)

197. Will you indicate difficulties experienced by the building committee in securing transfers from one appropriation to another to meet emergencies, etc.?

Answer. Emergencies require instant action. The chief difficulty is the time it takes. See also the court record in the case of the F. A. Clark Co. vs. the Board of Education, now pending.

198. Have you visited the repair shops in Brooklyn? Will you include a reference to the economies effected by repairing instead of throwing away desks, etc.?

Answer. Not material to statements in the report. The limits of time forbade an exhaustive and all-inclusive report.

294 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

199. Does the filing of a communication as to dry dusting, etc., cause you to modify your former statements as to uniform efficiency of committees?

Answer. No. The committee is working short-handed as to funds. (See p. 195.)

200. What evidence did you find that the Board of Education had been studying questions covered in your criticisms of conditions of buildings?

Answer. The question is not definite. See the replies and documents submitted by the Superintendent of School Buildings. (See p. 181, *et seq.*)

201. In preparing your criticism as to care of buildings, what meetings did you have with different committees of the board?

Answer. A number with the committee on the care of buildings, also with the Superintendent of School Buildings. The matter is fully discussed also in the minutes of the building committee.

202. Did you consult the minutes of the committees that have taken up this salary question?

Answer. What salary question?

203. Will you describe any devices outlined by the Board of Education to pay janitors adequately?

Answer. Not material to the statements of the report. Both their salaries and the total amount of money available for their work are fixed in the City Hall now.

204. Will you indicate where and in what amount the "Board of Estimate made considerable reduction in the supply estimate for 1912"?

Answer.

	Request of Bd. Ed.	Allowed by Bd. Est. and Appor.	Decrease
Borough of Manhattan . . .	\$533,484.39	\$433,394.08	\$100,090.31
Borough of The Bronx . . .	146,801.58	115,625.80	31,175.78
Borough of Brooklyn	518,142.37	423,332.40	94,809.97
Borough of Queens	112,532.72	93,432.00	19,100.72
Borough of Richmond . . .	30,303.75	25,267.22	4,036.53

See page 211.

The "Two Hundred and Forty-One Questions" 295

205. What notices, if any, has the Board of Education given to the Board of Estimate that the 1912 allowances were inadequate?

Answer. Its estimates asked for more money for 1912 and it did not get it. See table above.

206. What steps did the committee on supplies take to investigate the complaint made by the City Superintendent April 25, 1911?

Answer. Not material to the statement of the report. (See p. 214.)

207. Did you learn why the Board of Superintendents has failed to furnish the tariff necessary to standardize supplies?

Answer. Not material to the statement in the report.

208. Is it not true that in the last seven years \$900,000 has been saved on fuel without decreasing the necessary heat, and that when lead pencils were standardized \$13,000 was saved on that item also? Should not this be stated?

Answer. Not material to my report; speculation.

209. Did you learn whether and when inventories are taken?

Answer. Supplies are inventoried in the schools at the close of school for the summer vacation, and in June and on December 31st in the depositories for school supplies. (See p. 219.) A continuous inventory is maintained by the building department.

210. Will you cite illustrations of changes in course of study without proper notice to the supply department?

Answer. Any change made in the course of the year requiring a larger expenditure of money, when funds allowed were inadequate. A recent change in the course in drawing, I think, is in point. (See p. 219.)

211. Is your judgment of the method and efficiency of the free lecture system based upon your examination of the records or upon conditions actually observed?

Answer. My statements have regard to the plan or system. To have studied the details of its working would have required as much time as I was allowed for the whole report. (See p. 224.)

296 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

212. Will you care to include power of a local school board through its secretary to call for school records, etc.?

Answer. What records? I do not think it advisable that they should oversee records of pupils' standing, though records of attendance might advantageously be inspected by them.

213. Did you attempt to secure from the Borough President of Manhattan results of his examination of all minute books of local school boards?

Answer. I did not, as I did not undertake the examination of their minutes.

214. Have you noted any change in the activity of the boards since 1910?

Answer. This does not attempt to be a comparative study going back through several years.

215. Will you include reference to the handbook prepared by the Manhattan Central Council?

Answer. Yes. I think it makes the responsibilities of the local boards much too elaborate.

216. Can you cite any local boards in New York which are doing the kind of work that you commend for local boards?

Answer. See report on visitation in the chapter on the Local School Boards, pages 226 *et seq.*

217. Would you say who should prepare the list of questions for the members of school boards to answer in their visits?

Answer. What list of questions? They are not examiners.

218. Will you give illustrations of interference by local school boards in class work?

Answer. Not pertinent, as it is not alleged in the report. (See p. 232.)

219. Do you wish the statement to stand unqualified that the minutes of the Board of Education show "that its committees consider local board recommendations and act upon them"?

Answer. Yes, for as a rule they do. (See p. 233.)

220. Will you indicate matters which have not been, but which should be submitted to local boards for report and suggestion?

Answer. I am not trying the Board of Education, but the general adequacy of the system. See the report for matters which should be submitted to them. (See p. 232.)

221. Can you give the facts as to tardy local reports?

Answer. Any one can get them who will go to the trouble, as I did, of going over all their reports for one year. The matter is not worth a table of dates, though that might be furnished. (See p. 228.)

222. Can you give illustrations of helpfulness by local school boards to teachers and principals?

Answer. Not material to my statement, for which I have documentary proof. (See p. 233.)

223. How many local school board meetings did you visit?

Answer. Not material to an examination of how they perform their charter functions and duties. They reported for themselves.

224. How many meetings of the central organization of school boards did you visit?

Answer. I made arrangements to visit one. Because of the *Titanic* disaster it was not held. This is not an official, but a voluntary organization, seemingly a very good and helpful one, but not within the limits of our investigation.

225. Did you confer with the borough presidents who appoint local board members or with the secretaries who represent them?

Answer. I did not as I had no occasion to. I did confer, as I have said above, with one of the most active officers of the central organization.

APPENDIX B

A CHAPTER ON THE MAKING OF A SCHOOL BUDGET

THE Board of Education of the City of New York submitted the estimates of its needs for the year 1913 in due form according to law to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. It asked for the following:

General School Fund, \$30,952,602.91, which was an increase of \$2,531,001.87 over its appropriations for 1912.

Special School Fund, \$7,364,047.67, an increase of \$1,935,828.97. The need for these sums was set forth in elaborate statistical tables of actual expenditure for 1912 and very detailed explanations as to the shortages in present funds and the prospective needs of the board.

Section 1060 of the charter declares: "It shall be the duty of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and of the Board of Aldermen to indicate in the budget in raising the Special School Fund the respective amounts thereof which shall be available for use in the several boroughs. The general school fund shall be raised in bulk and for the city at large. The Board of Education shall have power to administer and shall administer all moneys appropriated or available for educational purposes in the City of New York."

When these estimates emerged in the form of a budget from the office of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment on November 6, 1912, and were transmitted to the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, they were preceded by a body of nine resolutions limiting the use of the funds appropriated, all of which resolutions prescribed the same rules and regulations to the Board of Education as to all other city departments. One of these resolutions read: "Resolved that the several Boards, Departments, Offices and Bureaus of the City and County Government are hereby directed to keep records dating from January 1, 1913, showing the cost price per unit, the number of units purchased, and the total cost of all articles, equipment, supplies, and materials purchased in 1913 and charged against appropriations made in this Budget; and such Boards, Departments, Offices and Bureaus are directed to submit to the Comptroller at the first of each month a statement of purchases made the preceding month, and also a statement of all articles of equipment, supplies and materials consumed in the preceding month." Imagine for a moment the labor involved and the inherent impossibility of meeting this requirement in a department,

A Chapter on the Making of a School Budget 299

the volume of whose business required it to estimate its needs for the year for running expenses at \$38,316,650.58! And note what an interference with its by-laws which the law gives it the power to make and with its right and duty to administer all moneys appropriated for school purposes such a regulation involves.

When the estimates of the Board of Education emerged from the office of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, they looked like the following. Note particularly the compliance with the law which says specifically that the Board of Education shall administer all moneys appropriated for school purposes which is indicated under code numbers 3453 and 3454, and compare the totals in the following budget with the totals of the estimates as given above.

From *The City Record*, November 12, 1912.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

General School Fund.

For the General School Fund for the year 1913 the equivalent of three mills on every dollar of assessed valuation of the Real and Personal Estate in the City of New York, liable to taxation, as certified to the Board of Education by the Department of Taxes and Assessments, including so much of the State School Money apportioned by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the City of New York, or any of the Counties contained therein, which State School Money when received shall be paid into the General Fund for the Reduction of Taxation \$24,614,587.29

Additional amount allowed for the year 1913, in excess
of the product of the three-mill tax 4,807,013.75

\$29,421,601.04

Recommended Apportionment of General School Fund.

3422.	Day Elementary Schools	\$22,535,612.64
3423.	Day High Schools	4,035,784.91
3424.	Training Schools for Teachers	197,538.92
3425.	Vocational Schools	85,776.59
3426.	Parental and Truant Schools	28,744.85
3427.	Evening Trade Schools	79,397.00
3428.	Evening High Schools	357,607.00
3429.	Evening Elementary Schools	363,028.00
3430.	Vacation Schools, Playgrounds, Recreation Centers and Baths	250,000.00
3431.	General Administration	326,272.90

300 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

3432. Special Branches in Day Elementary Schools . . .	\$725,790.34
3433. Attendance Officers	118,417.89
3434. Corporate Schools	252,630.00
3435. Lecturers' Fees	65,000.00

Total General School Fund \$29,421,601.04

Special School Fund.—Personal Service.—Salaries Regular Employees.—Administration.

3436. Office of the Secretary	\$45,810.00
3437. Office of the Auditor	66,450.00
3438. Office of the City Superintendent of Schools . . .	77,520.00
3439. Offices of the District Superintendents	20,489.86
3440. Office of the Superintendent of School Supplies . .	154,420.00
3441. Office of the Superintendent of School Buildings .	81,370.00
3442. Office of the Supervisor of Janitors	12,450.00
3443. Office of the Supervisor of Lectures	8,040.00

Maintenance.—Bureau of Buildings, Division of Repairs, Tax Levy and Corporate Stock Force.

3444TC. Tax Levy Allowance	134,933.33
3445. Manhattan Truant School	5,240.00
3446. Brooklyn Truant School	8,230.00
3447. New York Parental School	15,600.00
3448. Nautical School	29,750.00

Salaries Temporary Employees.

3449. Nautical School	675.00
---------------------------------	--------

Wages Regular Employees.—Maintenance.—Bureau of Buildings, Division of Repairs.—Tax Levy and Cor- porate Stock Force.

3450TC. Tax Levy Allowance	1,390.00
3451. Tax Levy Force	59,770.00

Wages Temporary Employees.—Administration.

3452. Office of the Superintendent of School Supplies . .	620.00
3453. Force for Efficiency and Statistics	23,000.00

The above allowance of \$23,000 for Force for Efficiency and Statistics is made by the Board of Estimate and Ap-

A Chapter on the Making of a School Budget 301

portionment under the terms and conditions that no contract shall be entered into for services to be paid out of this allowance without the approval of said Board.

4354. Accounting Force \$25,000.00

The above allowance of \$25,000 for an Accounting Force in the Department of Education is to be used for accounting purposes upon terms and conditions to be prescribed by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

Maintenance.

3455. Bureau of Buildings, Division of Repairs 1,844.50

3456. Public Lecture Centers 34,000.00

\$806,602.69

Supplies. — Food Supplies.

3457. Truant Schools \$25,669.48

3458. Forage and Veterinary Supplies, Truant Schools 1,049.20

Fuel Supplies.

3459. Borough of Manhattan 235,278.35

3460. Borough of The Bronx 74,230.46

3461. Borough of Brooklyn 236,787.65

3462. Borough of Queens 87,155.50

3463. Borough of Richmond 15,235.40

3464. Office Supplies — Office of the Secretary 18,615.86

3465. Office Supplies — Office of the Auditor 17,913.16

3466. Office Supplies — Office of the City Superintendent
of Schools 21,127.79

Office Supplies.

3467. Offices of the District Superintendents 2,117.34

3468. Office of the Superintendent of School Supplies 14,291.99

3469. Office of the Superintendent of School Buildings 9,340.12

3470. Office of the Supervisor of Janitors 451.03

3471. Office of the Supervisor of Lectures 1,200.00

3472. Offices of Truant Schools 5,200.00

Laundry, Cleaning and Disinfecting Supplies.

3473. Bureau of Supplies 37,309.52

3474. Truant Schools 950.00

302 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

Educational and Recreational Supplies.

3475.	Borough of Manhattan	\$474,801.32
3476.	Borough of The Bronx	126,543.10
3477.	Borough of Brooklyn	464,571.42
3478.	Borough of Queens	102,135.35
3479.	Borough of Richmond	28,980.27
3480.	Office of the Supervisor of Public Lectures	13,300.00
3481.	Library and Laboratory Apparatus, Regent's Schools	42,124.00
3482.	Manhattan Trade School	500.00
3483.	Supplies for Athletics	5,000.00
3484.	Motor Vehicle Supplies—Bureau of Supplies . .	2,380.18
3485.	Truant Schools	500.00

General Plant Supplies.

3486.	Truant Schools	500.00
		<hr/>
		\$2,065,258.49

Purchase of Equipment.—Office Equipment.

3487.	Bureau of Supplies	\$1,000.00
-------	------------------------------	------------

Household Equipment.

3488.	Truant Schools	1,050.00
-------	--------------------------	----------

Motor Vehicles and Equipment.

3489.	Bureau of Supplies	12,280.18
-------	------------------------------	-----------

Wearing Apparel.

3490.	Truant Schools	2,018.37
-------	--------------------------	----------

Educational and Recreational Equipment.

3491.	Borough of Manhattan	23,456.11
3492.	Borough of The Bronx	6,251.41
3493.	Borough of Brooklyn	22,953.49
3494.	Borough of Queens	5,044.80
3495.	Borough of Richmond	1,437.17
3496.	Phonographs	3,000.00
3497.	Playground Equipment	15,000.00
3498.	Bureau of Public Lectures	9,600.00
3499.	Libraries and Laboratory Apparatus, Regent's Schools	1,000.00

A Chapter on the Making of a School Budget 303

3500.	Manhattan Trade School	\$500.00
3501.	Equipment of Athletics	5,000.00

Equipment of Kindergartens, Kitchens, and Workshops.

3502.	Borough of Manhattan	12,240.00
3503.	Borough of The Bronx	9,180.00
3504.	Borough of Brooklyn	9,490.00
3505.	Borough of Queens	3,218.00

Equipment of Ungraded and Open-Air Classes.

3506.	Borough of Manhattan	6,580.00
3507.	Borough of The Bronx	1,600.00
3508.	Borough of Brooklyn	2,600.00
3509.	Borough of Queens	1,600.00

Equipment of Classes for Deaf, Blind and Crippled Children.

3510.	Borough of Manhattan	1,207.00
3511.	Borough of The Bronx	545.00
3512.	Borough of Brooklyn	2,275.00
3513.	Borough of Richmond	120.00

Equipment of Gymnasiums in Old Buildings.

3514.	Borough of Manhattan	12,690.00
3515.	Borough of The Bronx	630.00
3516.	Borough of Brooklyn	13,980.00
3517.	Borough of Queens	1,560.00
3518.	Borough of Richmond	1,140.00

Equipment of Public Lecture Centers.

3519.	All Boroughs	4,200.00
-------	------------------------	----------

Equipment of Vocational School.

3520.	Borough of Manhattan	4,550.00
-------	--------------------------------	----------

General Plant Equipment. — Furniture.

3521.	Borough of Manhattan	38,724.55
3522.	Borough of The Bronx	10,011.93
3523.	Borough of Brooklyn	22,471.41

304 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

3524.	Borough of Queens	\$3,729.64
3525.	Borough of Richmond	1,047.85

Pianos.

3526.	Borough of Manhattan	8,480.00
3527.	Borough of The Bronx	1,060.00
3528.	Borough of Brooklyn	4,240.00
3529.	Borough of Queens	3,445.00
3530.	Borough of Richmond	1,060.00

Janitorial Equipment.

3531.	Bureau of Supplies	42,268.13
3532.	Truant Schools	4,015.82

\$339,550.86

Materials.

3533.	Bureau of Lectures	\$1,050.00
-------	------------------------------	------------

Contract or Open Order Service.—General Repairs.

3534.	Borough of Manhattan	353,549.70
3535.	Borough of The Bronx	86,634.32
3536.	Borough of Brooklyn	324,612.40
3537.	Borough of Queens	93,025.38
3538.	Borough of Richmond	29,824.93
3539.	Truant Schools	75.00

Furniture Repairs.

3540.	All Boroughs	\$1,571,388.87
3541.	Borough of The Bronx	10,011.94
3542.	Borough of Brooklyn	22,471.41
3543.	Borough of Queens	3,729.64
3544.	Borough of Richmond	1,047.85

Piano Repairs.

3545.	Borough of Manhattan	2,600.00
3546.	Borough of The Bronx	1,200.00
3547.	Borough of Brooklyn	3,200.00
3548.	Borough of Queens	1,200.00
3549.	Borough of Richmond	1,000.00

A Chapter on the Making of a School Budget 305

Janitorial Service.

3550.	All Boroughs	\$1,571,388.87
3551.	Public Lecture Bureau	9,000.00

Transportation. — Transportation of Pupils.

3552.	Borough of Manhattan	17,904.90
3553.	Borough of The Bronx	23,522.19
3554.	Borough of Brooklyn	14,732.25
3555.	Borough of Queens	42,466.60
3556.	Borough of Richmond	7,869.35

Car Fare.

3557.	Inspectors	4,565.00
3558.	Teachers	1,861.29
3559.	Truant Schools	1,306.56
3560.	Expressage	775.00
3561.	Hire of Automobiles	805.00
3562.	Storage of Automobiles	1,200.00
3563.	Transportation for Public Lecture Bureau	600.00

Communication.

3564.	Telephone Service	14,595.90
3565.	Messenger Service	2,600.00

Motor Vehicle Repairs.

3566.	Bureau of Supplies	1,180.18
3567.	Truant Schools	200.00

General Plant Service.

3568.	Maintenance of Truants in Catholic Protectory	14,040.00
3569.	Cartage of School Supplies	32,391.00
3570.	Purchase of Water — Borough of Brooklyn	2,500.00
3571.	Purchase of Water — Borough of Queens	5,000.00
3572.	Borough of Richmond	50.00
3573.	Music for Evening Roof Playgrounds	12,672.00

Rental of Tabulating Machines.

3574.	Bureau of Audit	882.00
3575.	Bureau of Supplies	1,080.00
3576.	Rental of Burglar Alarms	730.00

\$2,758,825.21

306 *How New York City Administers Its Schools*

Contingencies.

3577. Board of Education	\$12,500.00
3578. Truant Schools	57.73
3579. Public Lecture Bureau	900.00

\$13,457.73

Fixed Charges and Contributions.

3580. Public Lecture Bureau — Rent	\$8,000.00
--	------------

Special.

3581. Support of Nautical School	22,291.28
--	-----------

Total Special School Fund \$ 6,015,036.26

Total Department of Education 35,436,637.30

Next, the Board of Aldermen exercised its right to reduce these appropriations for educational purposes to the extent of \$225,790.34, taking this sum from item 3432, which the Board of Estimate, contrary to the provisions of the charter, had segregated to provide for the teaching of special branches, such as sewing, cooking, manual training, etc., in the day elementary schools. Mr. John Martin, a very active member of the Board of Education, then made the following public statement in regard to this cut which gravely threatens the educational work of the schools:

“While the action of the Board of Aldermen in cutting the budget of the Board of Education is unwise, it should be remembered that Messrs. Prendergast, Mitchel, and McAneny, who have sent the Mayor a protest against the cut, are themselves responsible for it. Had they not illegally segregated the General School Fund, the Board of Aldermen would not have had before it any separate item for teachers of special subjects, nor been invited to consider, contrary to law, what parts of the school curriculum they could stamp with their disapproval.

“Precisely to prevent such action by political bodies, the law requires that the fund for paying teachers ‘shall be raised in bulk and for the city at large,’ its distribution being exclusively the function of the Board of Education.

“The Board of Estimate and Apportionment last year took upon itself to dictate to the Board of Education exactly how the general fund should be distributed between elementary schools, high schools, evening schools, special branches, and the like, and en-

deavored to compel the Board of Education to become a party to this lawlessness by attaching to its appropriation the condition that the Board of Education should accept the segregation set out. Thereupon the Board of Aldermen also entered the game and made a further cut in the item for teachers of special branches.

"This year the Board of Estimate Budget Committee has again overstepped its legal authority and thus invited the Board of Aldermen to do precisely the sort of thing it has unwisely done. The Board of Estimate and Apportionment cut down the appropriation for specific activities. For instance, it allows for evening elementary schools \$34,000 less for 1913 than is being expended on them in 1912, although this year's appropriation is insufficient, and the schools must be closed a week before the end of the session, unless a surplus can be found at the last moment in some other account.

"Altogether, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, according to its own statement, cut the appropriation for educational purposes by \$2,908,000 and the Board of Aldermen by \$229,790.

"Is the cut by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment a proof of virtue and the cut by the Board of Aldermen a proof of vice?

"The members of the Board of Aldermen would not affront the Budget Committee of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment by charging, as it charges against the Board of Aldermen, that its action was not 'honestly or intelligently designed to improve the city service or effect real economies,' yet it would be unfair to permit the impression to be created that the Board of Aldermen in this matter were greater sinners than others who dwell in the City Hall."

So great was the public clamor against the action of the Board of Aldermen that the Mayor of the city appointed a day for a public hearing upon it, and after a spirited discussion of its effect upon the work of the schools the Mayor is reported to have announced his intention to veto this reduction if the Board of Education would stand by the original cut made by the Board of Estimate and not ask for special revenue bonds to run the schools during the year.

On Tuesday, December 10, however, he sent a message to the Board of Aldermen announcing that "after most careful consideration I have determined not to disapprove of your cut of \$229,790.34 in the budget of the Board of Education. You made a similar cut last year, and that board had no trouble in getting through the year without discharging any teachers. The trouble is that the Board of Education has persistently refused to furnish the Board of Estimate and your honorable body with the data which are essential to the consideration of its budget. We are all compelled to act thereon without any information of

the amount of accruals of salaries in that board for several years past. We now know that last year there was a large balance at the end of the year in the Board of Education funds made up of such accruals. It was several hundred thousand dollars, at least. Presumably, there is such a balance existing this year. The Board of Education has refused to furnish us with the figures showing such accruals, and the total amount thereof. They say they have not a sufficient staff to keep such a record. I am not willing to accede to this, nor are my associates in the Board of Estimate, as I understand them, nor are you. The number of resignations and deaths of teachers each year is very large. Those who resign or die are succeeded by new teachers who are paid smaller salaries than were paid to those whom they succeed, as the salaries of teachers increase year by year by a certain established increment. From this source there is a very large saving in the salaries each year."

The statement that the Board of Education has refused to furnish figures showing such accruals and the total amount thereof is a considerable distance from the fact, for on page 1 of its printed estimates for the year 1913 are the following sentences: "It will be observed that no deduction has been made from the General School Fund for the difference between the salaries of teachers who may leave the system at higher rates than those paid their successors. This item is very complicated and the causes and effects are so intangible and variable that it is practically impossible to reduce the item to a detailed arithmetical computation. The amount of saving is contingent upon the number of teachers who may leave the system, the salaries of such persons, the salaries of their successors, the elapsed time between cessations of service and appointments and the cost of substitute service in the interim. All of these factors are constantly fluctuating. It is believed, however, that a deduction of \$150,000 may be made from the total of the General School Fund as herein submitted." Now every city school superintendent knows that these figures are not only next to impossible to get and would require the time of a bureau of at least two or three persons, to collect them from day to day, but that when they are once compiled they have little or no exact relation to similar figures for the succeeding year. Prediction cannot be based upon them from year to year. If they had been taken for a long period, say of twenty years, they might furnish a curve which would have a certain hypothetical value in forecasting the future. But that has not been done and the Board of Education cannot now do it. Yet the most extravagant statements are made by city officials in regard to this matter. For example, the *New York Tribune* of Monday, November 18, 1912, reports an address of Mr. John Purroy Mitchel, in which the following statement is ascribed to him: "The accrued salaries, due to resignations of well-paid teachers and the substitution of lower-salaried

teachers, constitute the 'margin of velvet,' which amounts to anywhere from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000, and on which the Board of Education is able to institute expenditures for which appropriation has not been made."

What are the facts? The aggregate amount of the salaries of teachers who dropped out of service for one reason or another for three years, from the time of their leaving the service to the end of the fiscal year, at the rate of pay they were getting when they left, was as follows:

For the calendar and fiscal year 1909	\$592,155.14
For the calendar and fiscal year 1910	554,617.36
For the calendar and fiscal year 1911	551,992.25

So that if the places of these teachers had remained vacant until the end of the year, the Board of Education would have saved the above sums. But they did not remain vacant. Other teachers were at once appointed to them, and the statement that the Board of Education saves at least several hundred thousand dollars per year from accruals is grotesque. Superintendent Maxwell declares that the funds on hand at the end of last year, which Mayor Gaynor describes above as a "large balance. It was several hundred thousand dollars, at least," actually amounted to \$114,796.35, which amount is subject to the outcome of claims in litigation and other claims which may await presentation. The probable balance for this year will hardly exceed \$20,000. All such funds remaining unused after the business of the year is completed lapse and pass into the fund for the reduction of taxation. They represent an insignificant margin of safety maintained by the greatest parsimony of expenditure during the year. They are themselves the evidence of crippling in school department funds.

Better evidence of the imperative need for providing for the necessities of the schools without recourse to politicians and the exposure of the children to their inconsiderate and careless treatment would be hard to find. The method which Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, Denver, and Indianapolis were driven to employ is necessary in New York, to safeguard the welfare of the young and helpless.

APPENDIX C

TRANSFERS IN 1912

Name	Title	Office	Salary	Date of Transfer	To Department Transferred
Geo. McG. Archibald	Clerk	Supply Bureau	\$600.00	May 22, 1912	Water Supply
Wm. S. Claffy . . .	Steno. Type.	Supply Bureau	900.00	May 31, 1912	President Richmond
Arthur J. Kennedy .	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	600.00	April 18, 1912	Water Supply
William T. Maher .	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	600.00	May 17, 1912	Water Supply
Thomas J. Madden .	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	600.00	June 27, 1912	Water Supply
Isaac Meyerson . .	Clerk	Supervisor of Janitors	300.00	April 15, 1912	Finance
Mabel Seely	Steno. Type.	Secretary's Office	750.00	Nov. 1, 1912	Water Supply
Samuel Siegal . . .	Clerk	Supply Bureau	600.00	March 24, 1912	Water Supply
Samuel Simon . . .	Clerk	Supply Bureau	1,200.00	Aug. 9, 1912	Mayor
James J. Smith . .	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	600.00	June 30, 1912	Water Supply
Frank L. Vock . . .	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	660.00	May 17, 1912	Water Supply

APPENDIX D

RESIGNATIONS IN 1912

Name	Title	Office	Salary	Date of Resignation
John P. Barrett	Clerk	Supply Bureau	\$600.00	June 19, 1912
Wm. J. Camp	Clerk	Supply Bureau	540.00	May 2, 1912
Harry Cohen	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	300.00	June 29, 1912
John F. Conahey	Steno. & Type.	Secretary's Office	900.00	Dec. 6, 1912
Jas. T. Delaney	Laborer	Supply Bureau	750.00	Nov. 14, 1912
Eugene Duffy	Clerk	Supply Bureau	420.00	Dec. 6, 1912
Reta A. Dussman	Tele. Switch. Oper.	Secretary's Office	750.00	May 15, 1912
Benjamin I. Factor	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	900.00	Feb. 13, 1912
Charlotte A. Friedhof	Type. Copyist	Building Bureau	600.00	June 30, 1912
Isidore Galef	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	300.00	Sept. 6, 1912
Louis Goldstein	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	600.00	Sept. 21, 1912
Jacob Gordon	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	600.00	Jan. 15, 1912
Chas. E. Knapp	Clerk	Supply Bureau	300.00	Sept. 14, 1912
Georgette L. Lasher	Steno. & Type.	Building Bureau	600.00	Jan. 18, 1912
Elizabeth M. McLaughlin	Clerk	City Supt. Office	900.00	Oct. 1, 1912
Herman Miller	Clerk	Auditing Bureau	600.00	Sept. 14, 1912
Mary M. Naughton	Steno. & Type.	Dist. Supt. Office	750.00	Sept. 3, 1912
Jacob Olendorf	Clerk	Supply Bureau	300.00	Oct. 31, 1912
Isidore Rosenberg	Clerk	Supply Bureau	300.00	April 4, 1912
Chas. M. Schroeder	Clerk	City Supt. Office	480.00	Oct. 28, 1912
Jos. F. Tisch	Clerk	Supply Bureau	540.00	Nov. 7, 1912
Pauline E. Xeller	Type. Copyist	City Supt. Office	600.00	Feb. 5, 1912

Index

INDEX

- Abbott's Municipal Corporations, 18.
Accounting, force, 301; methods of, 75; school, 113; uniform, 272.
Accounts, synchronizing, 271.
Acquiring sites, 155.
Adams, R. H., 36.
Administration, general, 299; good school, 87; plan of, 1; prevented, 111; should be consolidated, 85.
Administrative staff, 104.
Air-washers, 188.
Aldermen, Board of, 4; interference by, 260; power of, 42.
Alterations and Repairs, 35.
Anæmic children, 224.
American School Hygiene Association, 183.
Answers to the two hundred and forty-one questions, 241.
Apportionment of Inspectors, 176.
Appraisal and investigation bureau, 120.
Appropriation, by board of estimates, 266; general school fund, 70; general school fund, and "Mill" Tax compared, 63; related to assessed valuation, 57; effect of reduced, 180.
Appropriations, insufficient, 49, 205; school fund, 61.
Assessed valuation, 57; per cent of increase, 70; real and personal property, 58.
Athletics, Committee on, 2.
Athletic league, the Public School, 224.
Atlanta, 85.
Attendance, average daily, 64-69; offices, 300; percentage of increases, 70, 267; school, 1907-11, 5, 6; in twenty leading cities, 6.
Auditor, report from, 153.
Authority, conflicting, 198.
Average attendance, percentage of increases, 70, 267.
Average daily attendances, 64-69.
Baltimore, average daily attendance, 6.
Bases of figures used, 268.
Baths, 299.
Beardsley, L. A., 214.
Bids, opening of, 168.
Blackboards, no funds for, 54.
Blind, children, 224; supplies for, 54; equipment, 303.
Board of Education, its work, 109; its committees, 94; and department of finance, 77; and board of estimate, 127; character and size of, 88; the kind needed, 85; does not do the work as a Board, 103; size of, 85, 88, 273.
Board of estimate and apportionment, vii, 4; and school work, 261; appropriations by, 266; powers of, 23.
Boards, offices and bureaus, 3.
Bookcases, library, 138.
Books, etc., purchase of, 24.
Boston, 85; average daily attendance, 6; charter, the, 78.
Bronx, school premises and inspectors, 178.
Brooklyn, Board of Education *v.* Ridenour, 12; school premises and inspectors, 178.
Buffalo, average daily attendance, 6.
Budget Requests and "Mill products" compared, 62; per cent of increase, 70; and special school fund, 73.
Budgets, 60; for 1911, 252; the two school, 129.
Buildings, and the supplies committee, 191; bureau of, 300; care of, 192; completed, 174; committee on, 124; duties of, 165; construction of, 165; corporate stock budget for, 143; fireproof, 189; inspectors of, 172; owned or controlled by Board, 210; reports on condition of, 186; school, 24; Superintendent of, 27.

- Bureau of investigation needed, 117;
 of lectures, 222; of supplies, 300;
 of standards, 119.
 Bureaus, boards and offices, 3.
 Business manager, the, 274.
 By-Laws committee, 2.
 By Laws and legislation, committee
 on, 39.

 Cabot, Dr. A. T., 183.
 Care of buildings, 192.
 Caretakers of athletic fields, 50.
 Car fare, 305.
 Carpenter, Professor, 182.
 Chapter, in the making of a school
 budget, A, 298; the omitted, viii.
 Charter, the N. Y. school, 1; the re-
 vised, 10.
 Charters of different cities compared,
 78.
 Character of the board, 88.
 Chicago, average daily attendance, 6;
 charter of, 81.
 Cincinnati, 84; average daily attend-
 ance, 6.
 City Hall, schools annexed to, 252.
 "City Record," advertising in, 7;
 Nov. 12, 1912, 299.
 City Superintendent, duties of, 276;
 functions of, 104, 106; on supplies,
 214.
 Claims of janitors unpaid, 206, 207.
 Class room, rearrangements, 51; unit,
 the, 144.
 Cleaning and ventilation, 187, 195;
 supplies, 301.
 Clerical help inadequate, 148.
 Cleveland, 84; average daily attend-
 ance, 6.
 Columbus, 84.
 Commissioners of education, 18, 19.
 Committee, on buildings, 124; on ele-
 mentary schools, 124; on school
 inquiry, vii, 244; on sites, 155; the
 executive, 123.
 Committees, 2, 94; action of, 100;
 duties of, 96.
 Common schools, control of, 18.
 Compartmental system, the, 98.
 Compensation of janitors, 210.
 Completed buildings, 174.
 Condition, and organization, 4; of
 buildings, 186.
 Consolidation of administration, 85.
 Construction, of buildings, 165; con-
 tracts, 176; inspection of, 169.
 Contingencies, 306.
 Contracts, letting of, 168.
 Contributions, 306.
 Control of schools, 18, 42; and finance,
 75, 84; of state school system, 18.
 Cooking rooms, equipment of, 138.
 Corporate schools, force, 300; average
 daily attendance, 69.
 "Corporate Stock," 6; budget, the,
 57, 142.
 Cost, accounting, 115; based on aver-
 age attendance, 113, 280; reporting
 on, 113.
 Creation of board of education, 88.
 Crippled children, 224.

 Daily attendance in twenty leading
 cities, 6.
 Day elementary schools, 299; attend-
 ance, 267.
 Day high schools, 299; attendance,
 267.
 Deaf children, 224; blind and crippled
 classes equipment, 303; school
 equipment, 138.
 Defects in board of education, 86; of
 present system, 95.
 Defective children, 224.
 Deficiency of supplies, 214.
 Delays in construction, 252, 254-257;
 in work, 98.
 Demoralization of janitorial staff, 203.
 Denver, 84; average daily attend-
 ance, 6.
 Department of finance and the board
 of education, 77; and the board of
 health, 112.
 Detroit average daily attendance, 6.
 Director, educational powers of, 104.
 Disinfecting, etc., supplies, 301.
 Distribution of reports, 123.
 Division of records, 126.
 Domestic Science supplies, 217.
 Doty, John, 214.
 Draper, A. S., on boards and individu-
 als, 96.

- Drawing supplies, 217.
 Dry Dock Realty Company, 35.
 Duplication of work, 102.
 Duties, of building committee, 165; city superintendent, 276; janitors, 192; of local school boards, 226.
 Duty, the most important, of the board, 89.
 Education law of 1910, 18, 19.
 Educational and recreational supplies, 301; director, the, 104; report of board, 121.
 Effect of reduced appropriations, 180.
 Electrical fund (special), 137; inspection, 175.
 Elementary schools average daily attendance, 64; committee on, 2, 124.
 Elementary science, supplies, 217.
 Employees of the board, 148.
 English, teaching to foreigners, 222.
 Equal salary bill, the, 17.
 Equipment, janitorial, 304; special rooms, 137.
 Equipments, various, 138, 302, 303.
 Estimates, Board of, 4, 127.
 Estimates of the board of education, 298; for 1913, reduction in, 294; framing of, 46; how they should be made, 140; how prepared, 127.
 Evening elementary schools, 299; attendance, 267; average attendance, 67.
 Evening high schools, 299; attendance, 267; average daily attendance, 68.
 Evening recreation centers, 223; attendance, 267.
 Evening roof playgrounds attendance, 267.
 Evening trades schools, 299.
 Examinations, medical, of school children, 112.
 Executive committee, 2.
 Expenditure on supplies, 215.
 Extension work, 222.
 Filing of records, 125.
 Finance and control, 75-84; committee on, 2.
 Financial report of board, 122.
 Figures in report, source of, 268.
 Fireproof school buildings, 189.
 Fire signals, 189.
 Fiscal, authorities, the, 251; year, the, and the school year, 121.
 Fixed charges, 306.
 Foreigners, language schools for, 222.
 Free lectures, 224.
 Freedom for the schools, 77.
 Friction in making estimates, 129.
 Fuel supplies, 301.
 Function of board of education, 89; of city superintendent, 104, 106; of education board, 85; of general manager, 108; of local school boards, 231.
 Funds, school, law concerning, 128; how controlled, 42.
 Furnishing of supplies, 211.
 Furniture, 303; inspection, 175; lack of funds for, 55; repairs, 304.
 Gas and electricity, 24.
 Gaynor, Judge, 11.
 General construction contracts, 176.
 General fund estimates, 130.
 General manager, 274; functions of, 108; needed, 91, 92; qualifications for, 105, 106.
 General manager's staff, 107.
 General plant equipment, 303; supplies, 301.
 General repairs, 72, 175, 304.
 General school fund, 25, 299; appropriations, 70, 266; budget request, 70; appropriations compared with mill tax product, 63; percentage of increase, 70.
 Gilbert, Frank B., 9.
 Goldrich, L. W., 214.
 Good school administration, 87.
 Growth of schools, 57.
 Gulick, Dr. L. H., 183.
 Gunnison v. Board of Education, 14, 37.
 Gymnasium, equipment of, 55, 138, 303.
 Hanus, Prof. P. H., instructions, preface, vii; for the report, 242.
 Harrington, Dr., 183.

- Health, department of, 112.
 Heating and ventilation, 175; special fund, 137; engineers, American institute of, 183.
 High schools, 267-268, 299; average daily attendance, 65; committee, 2.
 Hogan v. Board of Education, 26.
 Household equipment, 301.
 Hughes, Governor, 17.
 Humidifying apparatus, 187.
 Hutchinson v. Skinner, 1, 11, 21.
 Hygiene American school association of, 183.
 Inbreeding system, 111, 278.
 Increase in attendance, 62-69, 266-267; appropriation percentage of, 266; percentage of, in attendance, 267; of valuations, 58.
 Indianapolis charter, 80.
 Industrial training schools committee, 2.
 Inquiry, committee on school, vii, 242; scope of the, 242.
 Inspecting staff organization, 175.
 Inspection districts, 175.
 Inspectors, apportionment of, 176.
 Inspectors of buildings, 172; construction work, 169; of janitor's work, 196; of sheet metal work, 181.
 Instructions by Prof. P. H. Hanus, 242.
 Insufficient appropriations, 49.
 Interference by board of aldermen, 260.
 Inter-relation of departments, 104.
 Investigation, bureau of, 117.
 Janitors, assistants, 202; claims unpaid, 206, 207; compensations, 210; duties of, 192; salaries, 203; selection of, 8; work, how inspected, 196.
 Janitorial equipment, 304; services, 304; staff demoralised, 203.
 Jersey City, average daily attendance, 6.
 Johnson, T., 214.
 Jones v. Benton, 18.
 Kansas City Charter, 82.
 Keyser v. Board of Education, 21.
 Kimball, D. D., 183.
 Kind of board needed, 85.
 Kindergartens, equipment of, 138, 303; supplies, 217.
 Kirnbough v. Barrett, 18.
 Kitchen equipment, 303.
 Language schools for foreigners, 222.
 Laundry, cleaning and disinfecting supplies, 301.
 Law, concerning school funds, 128; the education, 9; of 1910, 18.
 Leases, 24; for offices, 33; how arranged for, 28; new, for elementary schools, 28; new, for premises, 28; renewals of, 33.
 Leasing of premises, 8.
 Lectures and libraries committee, 2; attendance, 267; bureau of, 222; public free, 224.
 Lecturers' fees, 300.
 Legal functions of the board, 9, 250; status of the board, 10.
 Legislation, committee on, 2.
 Letting contracts, 168.
 Libraries and lectures committee, 2; nurses' supplies, 217.
 Library bookcases, 138.
 Lighting the schools, 8, 24.
 Local school boards, 101, 226.
 London, board of education, 274.
 Los Angeles, average daily attendance, 6.
 Lumber supplies, 217.
 Maintenance, 300.
 Making a school budget, 298.
 Manager, general, needed, 91, 92; functions of, 108; qualifications of, 105, 106.
 Manhattan, school premises and inspectors, 176.
 Manual work teaching, 222.
 Martin, Mr. John, on reduction of estimates, 306.
 Medical examinations of children, 112, 279.
 Mentally defective children, 224.
 Methods, of accounting, 75; of furnishing supplies, 211.
 "Mill" products and budget requests compared, 62; per-cent of increase, 70.

- "Mill" Tax, product of, 59.
 Milwaukee, 84; average daily attendance, 6.
 Mimeograph supplies, 217.
 Minneapolis, average daily attendance, 6.
 Minutes of board and the executive committee, 124.
 Mitchel, Mr. John P., 242, 308.
 Moseley, Alfred, to the board of education, 118.
 Motor vehicles, 301; repairs, 305.

 Nautical schools, 306; attendance, 267; Committee, 2.
 Newark, average daily attendance, 6.
 New Orleans, average daily attendance, 6.
 New York, average daily attendance, 6.
 Normal College, the, 3, 43, 262.
 Number of school board members, 85.
 Nurses supplies, 217.

 O'Connor v. Hendrick, 20.
 Office equipment, 301; supplies, 301.
 Offices, boards and bureaus, 3; of the board, 148; leases of property for, 33.
 Omitted chapter, the, viii.
 Open-air classes, equipment, 138, 303.
 Organization and condition, 4.
 Origin of the book, vii.

 Parental and truant schools, 299.
 Parental school, waitress at, 53.
 Payment of school boards, 273.
 Pens and pencils, supplies, 217.
 People, the, *ex rel.* v. Bennett, 17.
 Percentages of increases in appropriations, 266; in attendance, 64-69, 266, 267.
 Personal service, 300.
 Philadelphia, 85; average daily attendance, 6; charter, 79.
 Physical training supplies, 217.
 Pictures, 55.
 Pianos, 137, 304; for kindergartens, 55, 56; how purchased, 190; repairs, 304.
 Pittsburg, average daily attendance, 6.

 Plan of administration, 1.
 Planning buildings, 165.
 Plans prepared in 12 months, 167.
 Playgrounds, 223, 229, 267; and specifications, 254-257.
 Portland, Oregon, 84.
 Power, funds for, 8.
 Premises, school, 176; leasing of, 8.
 Preparation of estimates, 127.
 Preparatory trade schools, 51.
 Principals associations, 213.
 Printed records and reports, 121.
 Procedure in making estimates, 141.
 Product of "Mill" tax, 59.
 Property, real and personal, valuation, 58.
 Public, lecture bureau, 306; centers equipment, 303.
 Public School Athletic League, 224.
 Pupils, transportation of, 305.
 Purchase and equipment, 301.

 Qualitative cost accounting, 114-280.
 Queens, school premises and inspectors, 179.
 Questions, answered, 241; summary of the, 241.

 Records and reports, 121; supplies, 217.
 Records, division of, 126.
 Recommendations, a summary of, 235.
 Recreation centers, 223, 299.
 Recreational supplies, 301.
 Reduced appropriations, effect of, 180.
 Reductions and transfers of funds, 72; by board of aldermen, 305; by board of estimates for 1912, 294.
 Rejection of Prof. Moore's report, vii.
 Removal of school officers, 20.
 Renewals of leases, 33.
 Reorganization, need of, 9; of care of buildings, 199.
 Requisition books, for supplies, 216.
 Requisitions for supplies, 217.
 Repair Budget, how made, 134.
 Repairs, 304; and alterations, 35; division of, 300; general, 175.
 Reporting on cost, 113.
 Reports, distribution of, 123; and rec-

- ords, 121; and statistics, 105; of superintendents; on care of buildings, 197.
- Resignations, 151; in 1912, 311.
- Richmond, school premises and inspectors, 179.
- Ridenour v., Board of Education, 11.
- Roof playgrounds, 267.
- San Francisco, average daily attendance, 6.
- St. Louis, 85, average daily attendance, 6; charter, 82.
- Salaries, 43, 45, 300; fixing, 153; how fixed, 26; of janitors, 203; power to fix, 43; schedules, 8, 149.
- Sanitary inspection, 175.
- School, a state institution, 11; accounting, 116; as a unit, 140; attendance in twenty cities, 6; attendance, 1907-11, 5-6; boards, payment of, 273; budget, making a, 298; building fund, 1898-1911, 71; fund, the, 25; appropriations, 61; budgets increase, 60; premises, 176; year and fiscal year, 122.
- Schools, annexed to city hall, 252; must be free, 77.
- Science Rooms, 137.
- Scientific study of need for sites, 158.
- Scope of the inquiry, 242.
- Seattle, 84.
- Selecting sites, 157.
- Service, janitorial, 304.
- Serving supplies, 217.
- Shallow, assoc. supt., on salaries, 50.
- Sheet metal, work inspection of, 181.
- Simplification of accounting methods, 75.
- Sinking fund commissioners, 37.
- Sites, 33, 291; acquiring of, 155; committee on, 2; corporate stock budget for, 142; selection of, 6.
- Situation in regard to sites, 161.
- Size of education board, 85, 88, 273.
- Smaller boards necessary, 85, 97.
- Snyder, C. B. J., 135, 170, 181.
- Sources, of the figures in the report, 268; of information, 293.
- Special branches, 300; school fund, amount available, 73; appropriations, 266, 300; estimates, 133; revenue bonds, 159; rooms, 137; supplies, 217; schools committee, 2.
- Specifications, 254-257.
- Staff of general manager, 107.
- Stair doors, closing of, 190.
- Standard, of accounting, 116; of teaching force, 111.
- Standards, a bureau of, 118.
- State commissioners, report to, 122.
- State funds and unexpended balances, 284.
- State institution, the school a, 11.
- Stationery supplies, 217; deficient, 53.
- Statistics and reports, 105.
- Statistical division, 120.
- Stephenson, John, 189.
- Steps in the preparation of plans and specifications for buildings, 254-257.
- Sterling, G. L., on teachers' salaries, 43, 45.
- Storehouse, a central, needed, 210.
- Studies and textbook committee, 2.
- Summary of recommendations, 235; of the questions, 241.
- Summer schools, 222.
- Superintendents' reports, 123.
- Supplementary school activities, 222.
- Supplies, committee, 2, 52; division estimates, 139; furnishing of, 210; fuel, 301; general plant, 301; office, 301; tariff of, 219.
- Supply requisition books, 216.
- Synchronizing accounts, 271.
- Tabulating machines, renting of, 305.
- Tariff of supplies, 219.
- Tax levy force, 300.
- Teachers from outside the city, 278.
- Teaching force, standard of, 111.
- Temporary buildings, 33; employees' salaries, 300.
- Textbook and studies committee, 2.
- Textbooks, condition of, 53; how chosen, 219.
- Thermostats, 55.
- Thompson, Maurice, J., 214.
- Toledo, 84.
- Trade schools, preparatory, 51.

- Training school, attendance, 267; average daily attendance, 66; committee, 2.
 Training schools for teachers, 299.
 Transfers and reductions of funds, 72.
 Transfers in 1911, 150; in 1912, 310; needed, 262, 263.
 Transportation of pupils, 305.
 "Tribune," the New York, 308.
 Truant schools, attendance, 267.
 Tuberculosis children, 224.
 Typewriter supplies, 217.
 Unexpended balances and state fund, 284.
 Ungraded classes, equipment, 138, 303.
 Unification needed, 198.
 Uniform accounting, 272.
 Unit, the proper, 116; the school as a, 140.
 Unpaid janitors' claims, 206, 207.
 Vacation, baths, attendance, 267; playgrounds, 267; schools, 223; attendance, 267.
 Vacuum cleaning plants, 188.
 Valuation and school growth, 57; of real and personal property, 58.
 Vance, Rufus A., 214.
 Ventilation, and cleaning, 187; and heating fund, 137.
 Vocational high schools, attendance, 267.
 Vocational school for boys, equipment, 138.
 Vocational schools, 299; committee, 2; equipment, 303.
 Wages, 300.
 Walrath v. O'Brien, 21.
 Washington, average daily attendance, 6.
 Water supply, 24.
 Wearing apparel, 301.
 Wiley v. Alleghany Co., 18.
 Wilsey, Hon. Frank D., 181.
 Winslow, Dr. C. F. A., 183.
 Winthrop, Hon. Egerton, L., Jr., 35, 43.
 Woodbridge, Prof., 182.
 Work, duplication of, 102.
 Working men and women, lectures to, 224.
 Workshops, 50; equipment of, 138, 303; supplies, 217.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 345 921 1